Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

https://archive.org/details/gospelaccordingt0000unse_n4a4

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN.

GEORGE BELL & SONS

LONDON: YORK STREET, COVENT GARDEN
NEW YORK: 66, FIFTH AVENUE, AND
BOMBAY: 53, ESPLANADE ROAD
CAMBRIDGE: DEIGHTON, BELL & CO.

WITHDRAWN

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN

WITH NOTES CRITICAL AND PRACTICAL

BY THE REV. M. F. SADLER

LATE RECTOR OF HONITON AND PREBENDARY OF WELLS

Bible. N.T. John. English

LONDON

GEORGE BELL AND SONS

1899

4-0318-7

WHEATON COLLEGE LIBRARY

WITHDRAWN

First published, November, 1883.
Second Edition, 1886.
Reprinted, 1887, 1888, 1890, 1893, 1897;
Re-issue, 1898; *Reprinted*, 1899.

INTRODUCTION.

LIFE OF ST. JOHN.

ST. JOHN, Apostle and Evangelist, "the disciple whom Jesus loved," was the son of Zebedee and Salome (compare Matth. xxvii. 56 with Mark xv. 40). Respecting Zebedee we know nothing whatsoever, except that he followed the occupation of a fisherman on the shores of the Sea of Galilee. He could not have been poor, for he had hired servants to assist him (Mark i. 20). He could not have been hostile to the Messianic claims of Jesus, as, apparently without a word of remonstrance, he suffered his sons to leave him with the hired labourers, and to follow the Lord as His constant companions.

Respecting Salome, we know more. Some have supposed, on the strength of a mere inference drawn from a very doubtful reading in John xix. 25 (see note), that she was the sister of the Virgin; in which case, St. John and the Lord would have been first cousins. But this is the merest conjecture. All that is said of her is to her honour. She appears to have had a very firm belief in Jesus as the Messiah and King of Israel; though, in common with all the disciples, she took a carnal view of His Kingdom, as appears by her request that her two sons might occupy the chief places of honour in it (Matth. xx. 20-24). She was one of the devoted and courageous women who stood by the Cross. And she was one of those who, on the morning of the Resurrection, went first to the Sepulchre (Mark xvi. 1).

Of the early youth of the Evangelist we are told nothing whatsoever. We first find him attached to the Baptist, as one of his disciples. All commentators seem to agree in the fact that he was one of the two disciples who, when John pointed to Jesus as the Lamb of God, immediately left the Baptist, and began to follow

00823-2-46-R

Jesus. That he should have been not merely one of those who heard John, and were baptized by him, but that he should have been of the select few who became attached to him as his disciples, argues a deep religious feeling; and that he should have left John, and followed Jesus, apparently on the single word that Jesus was the Lamb of God, seems to indicate in him some sense of personal need of such a Saviour as the title "Lamb of God" implies.

Though not as yet permanently attached to the Lord as one of the twelve, he certainly accompanied Him in His earliest ministry, and was present at the miracle in Cana, and the first cleansing of the Temple, for the account of both these bears every mark of having been written by an eye-witness; and the same may be said of the Lord's interview with Nicodemus, for it is never so much as hinted that our Lord and the inquiring Pharisee were absolutely alone. He must have been one of the disciples who were with the Lord at Sychar. After this, he resumed his occupation of a fisherman, not from any want of belief or desire to draw back, but because he and the other disciples had no other means of getting their living, not having been yet called to live entirely with the Lord as Apostles.

When the Lord set him apart to the Apostleship, He gave to him, and to his brother James, the name of Boanerges, "sons of thunder." This seems, at first sight, not to be in harmony with that view of him which we gather from the few hints in the Scriptures respecting his character, and which all tradition confirms, as being loving, retiring, contemplative rather than active, and somewhat feminine in gentleness. And yet there are unmistakeable indications of another side of his character, as, for instance, his forbidding one to cast out devils in the Lord's Name, because he belonged not to the Apostolic company (Mark ix. 38); and, along with his brother, praying Jesus that they might call down fire from heaven upon the Samaritan village which would not receive the Lord (Luke ix. 54). "But even in these vehement utterances," as Luthardt says, "love to Jesus was the moving soul: his nature only decided the form." "How also," asks Godet, "are we to explain two features of character apparently so opposite? There exist profound receptive natures, which are accustomed to shut up their impressions within themselves, and this all the more that these impressions are keen and thrilling. But, if it happens that these persons once cease to be masters of themselves, their long-restrained emotions then burst

forth in sudden explosions, which fill the persons around them with amazement. Does not the character of John belong to this order?"

There must have been that in this Apostle which raised him, in the estimation of the Searcher of hearts, above the majority of his brethren, in that Jesus selected him, together with his brother and Simon Peter, from among the rest of the Apostles, to witness such events as the raising of Jairus's daughter, the Transfiguration, and the Agony. He was the only Apostle who stood by the Cross, and then had the unspeakable honour of receiving from the Lord the charge of His mother, so that he should be to her in His place as her son. The Saviour must have seen in him extraordinary worthiness thus to trust him.

In the closing scenes in the Gospel, and in the Acts of the Apostles he appears as very intimately associated with St. Peter. It is Peter who makes the sign to him to get the name of the betrayer (John xiii. 23, 24). He obtains for Peter admittance into the palace of the high priest (xviii. 16). He runs with Peter to the sepulchre (xx. 3). Peter asks the Lord respecting his destiny (xxi. 21). He goes up with Peter at the hour of prayer to the Temple (Acts iii. 1); and seems to have joined with him in the healing of the lame man (Acts iii. 11, 12). He was side by side with Peter before the council (Acts iv. 13); and he was sent in company with him to lay hands upon the Samaritan converts (Acts viii. 14). But in no one of these cases is he reported to have said a single word. All the speaking falls to the lot of St. Peter. The last notice of his sojourn in Jerusalem is in Gal. ii. 9, where, fourteen years after St. Paul's first visit, he, together with Cephas and James, perceiving the grace of God in Paul and Barnabas, gave to them the right hand of fellowship.

Respecting his further sojourn in Jerusalem, both Scripture and tradition are silent. In the Book of the Revelation, of which the date is uncertain, he appears as exercising Apostolic rule over the Churches of Asia Minor; for the Lord, through him, sends letters to the several angels or bishops of these Churches; and Patmos, the island to which he had been banished for a time, was about twenty miles from that coast, opposite Miletus.

The early Fathers are unanimous about this district being the scene of the labours of his last years, and exceedingly beautiful some of these notices are. Eusebius gives one, taken from a lost

book of Clement of Alexandria, which gives an astonishing view of the love and earnestness of the Apostle as a pastor of souls:—

"Listen to a story which is no fiction, but a real history, handed down and carefully preserved, respecting the Apostle John. For, after the tyrant (Domitian) was dead, coming from the Isle of Patmos to Ephesus, he went also, when called, to the neighbouring regions of the Gentiles; in some to appoint bishops, in some to institute entire new Churches: in others to appoint to the ministry some one of those that were pointed out by the Holy Ghost. When he came, therefore, to one of those cities . . . . he turned to the bishop appointed, and seeing a youth of fine stature, graceful countenance, and ardent mind, he said, 'Him I commend to you with all earnestness in the presence of the Church, and of Christ.' The bishop having taken him and promised all . . . . he returned to Ephesus. The presbyter taking the youth home, ... educated, cherished, and restrained him, and at length baptized him. After this he relaxed his former care and watchfulness, as if he had now committed him to a perfect safeguard in the seal of the Lord. But certain idle, dissolute fellows, familiar with every kind of wickedness, unhappily attached themselves to him, thus prematurely freed from restraint. At first they led him on by expensive entertainments. Then going out at night to plunder, they take him with them . . . . At length, renouncing the salvation of God, he, having committed some great crime, since he was now ruined, expected to suffer equally with the rest. Taking, therefore, these same associates, and forming them into a band of robbers, he became their captain, surpassing them all in violence. Time elapsed, and on a certain occasion they sent for John. The Apostle, having set in order those other matters for which he came, said, 'Come, bishop, return me my deposit!' The bishop at first thought of a deposit of money . . . . but when John said, 'I demand the young man, and the soul of a brother,' the presbyter, groaning and also weeping, said, 'He is dead.' 'How and what death?' 'He is dead to God,' said he. 'He has turned out wicked and abandoned, and at last a robber.' The Apostle, hearing this, tore his garment, and beating his head with great lamentation said, 'I left a fine keeper of a brother's soul! But let a horse now be got ready, and some one to guide me on my way.' He rode as he was, away from the church, and coming to the country was taken prisoner by the outguard of the banditti. He neither attempted to flee, nor refused to be taken: but cried out: 'For this very purpose am I come; conduct me to your captain.' He, in the meantime, stood waiting, armed as he was. But, as he recognized John advancing towards him, overcome with shame, he turned about to flee. The Apostle, however, pursued him with all his might, forgetful of his age, and crying out, 'Why dost thou fly, my son, from me, thy father, thy defenceless, aged father? Have compassion on me, my son; fear not.

Thou still hast hope of life. I will intercede with Christ for thee. Should it be necessary I will cheerfully suffer death for thee, as Christ for us. I will give my life for thine. Stay; believe Christ hath sent me.' Hearing this he first stopped with downcast looks; then threw away his arms; then trembling, lamenting bitterly, and embracing the old man as he came up, attempted to plead for himself with his lamentations as much as he was able; as if baptized a second time with his own tears, and only concealing his right hand. But the Apostle pledging himself, and solemnly assuring him that he had found pardon for him in his prayers at the hands of Christ, praying on his bended knees, and kissing his right hand, as cleansed from all iniquity, conducted him back again to the Church. Then supplicating with frequent prayers, contending with constant fastings, and softening his mind with various consolatory declarations, he did not leave him, as it is said, until he had restored him to the Church" ("Eccles. Hist." iii. 23).

The occasion of the writing of his Gospel is thus described in Eusebius:—

"The three Gospels, previously written, having been distributed among all, and handed to him, they say that he admitted them, giving his testimony to their truth; but that there was only wanting in the narrative, the account of the things done by Christ, among the first of His deeds, and at the commencement of the Gospel. And this was the truth. For it is evident that the other three Evangelists only wrote the deeds of our Lord for one year after the imprisonment of John the Baptist, and intimated this in the very beginning of their history . . . . The Apostle (John) therefore in his Gospel gives the deeds of Jesus before the Baptist was cast into prison, but the other three Evangelists mention the circumstances after that event. One who attends to these circumstances can no longer entertain the opinion, that the Gospels are at variance with each other, as the Gospel of John comprehends the first events of Christ, but the others, the history that took place at the latter part of the time. It is probable, therefore, that for these reasons John has passed by in silence the genealogy of our Lord, because it was written by Matthew and Luke, but that he commenced with the doctrine of the Divinity, as a part reserved for him by the Divine Spirit, as if for a superior." (Euseb. iii. 24.)

It is evident that Eusebius here gives one reason, but not a sufficient one. If he had mentioned, in addition, that the Apostle intended also to supply the account of a ministry exercised at intervals in Jerusalem, and discourses and disputes with the Jews arising out of it, it would give a good account of the external form of the Gospel.

Tertullian speaks of St. John having, in will, suffered martyrdom

at Rome when, by order of Domitian, he was plunged into boiling oil, but escaped unhurt (Tertullian, On Prescription, ch. xxxvi.). Irenæus gives an anecdote somewhat in accordance with that vehement side of his character, which would call down fire from heaven upon those in error:—

"There are also those who heard from him (Polycarp) that John the disciple of the Lord, going to bathe at Ephesus, and perceiving Cerinthus within, rushed out of the bath-house without bathing, exclaiming, 'Let us fly, lest even the bath-house fall down, because Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth, is within.'" (Iren. bk. iii., ch. iii., sec. 4.)

Eusebius (Bk. v. 18), in a notice of the Anti-Montanist writer, Apollonius, tells us that he relates that a dead man was raised by the Divine Power through the same John at Ephesus. Cassian has also preserved an anecdote worthy of remembrance:—

"It is related that the blessed Evangelist John was one day gently caressing a partridge, and that a young man returning from hunting, seeing him thus employed, asked him in amazement how so illustrious a man could give himself up to so trifling an occupation? 'What dost thou carry in thy hand?' replied John. 'A bow,' said the youth. 'Why is it not bent as usual?' 'Not to take from it, by bending it too often, the elasticity which it should possess at the moment when I shall shoot forth my arrow!' 'Do not be shocked then, young man, at that brief solace which we allow to our mind, which otherwise losing its spring could not assist us when necessity requires it.'" ("Cassian, Collat." xxiv. c. 2.)

Another somewhat obscure notice of him in a letter of Polycrates, Bp. of Ephesus, to Victor, Bp. of Rome, is preserved by Eusebius (iii. 31). "Moreover, John, that rested on the bosom of our Lord, who was a priest that bore the sacerdotal plate [τὸ πέταλον] and martyr and teacher, he also rests at Ephesus."

Jerome relates also how, in extreme old age, when no longer able to walk, he was carried to the Christian assemblies, and there uttered over and over again the one word, "Little children, love one another." He was buried at Ephesus. I have given a tradition respecting his burial in a note on John xxi. 23.

AUTHENTICITY OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL.

The Catholic Church, as well as the various bodies of heretics and schismatics who have gone out from her, have, with the exception of one obscure and insignificant sect, received the Fourth Gospel as the work of the Apostle St. John, from the time of its publication to the end of the eighteenth century.

To enter somewhat into the significance of this we are to remember that, at various periods in the history of the Church, as, for instance, at the time of the Arian controversy in the fourth century, and at the time of the Reformation, men arose who denied, more or less explicitly, the true and proper Godhead of our Lord, of which Christian doctrine the Gospel of St. John seems to afford the most decisive proofs; and yet neither the followers of Arius in the fourth century, or of Socinus in the sixteenth, seem ever to have thought of questioning the Apostolic authorship of this Gospel, but contented themselves with explaining away the obvious meaning of some of its most prominent passages relating to our Lord's Person.

The authenticity of this Gospel was first seriously questioned at the end of the last century; and since that time a host of writers, mostly German Rationalists and English Socinians, have, on the most opposite and often mutually destructive grounds, denied it to be the work of St. John.

Let the reader remember that this means, that men, living eighteen hundred years after the publication of a certain text-book, question the testimony to its authorship of men who flourished within one hundred years after the publication of that book, and who were born within fifty years after the death of its author, and who had access to a considerable Christian literature, which existed between their day and that of the author of the book in question, which literature has since perished. These general statements we shall now make good.

By far the most important source of our knowledge of the early history of the Church is the "Ecclesiastical History" of Eusebius. Whatever his merits as an historian, there can be no doubt that he carefully investigated the history of the Canon of Scripture, and also the succession of ecclesiastical writers. His history is, in fact, to a great extent, a sketch of early Church literature. In dealing

with the history of the Canon, he particularly notices whether a large number of writers have quoted certain books of the New Testament, of whose acceptance by the whole Church doubts were entertained. We learn from him that the Church never received books as canonical, except upon sufficient evidence, and that evidence was the reception of each book by the whole Church from the earliest times. He gives an account of the publication of each of the Gospels—of Luke, bk. iii. ch. iv.; of Mark, in bk. ii. ch. xv.; of Matthew and John, in bk. iii. ch. xxiv. (this, so far as regards St. John, I have given in page ix. of this Introduction).

In giving a summary statement of the books of the New Testament, he begins it with, "Here, among the first, must be placed the Holy Quaternion of the Gospels. These are followed by the Book of the Acts," &c. (Bk. iii. 25.)

With respect to the Gospels, he knows but four as Canonical, and has never heard of any other as accepted by the Church. He mentions apocryphal and disputed books. Amongs the latter, he mentions the Gospel to the Hebrews; but he is wholly ignorant of doubt having ever been cast upon the authority of any of the four in any branch of the Catholic Church. Now, however Eusebius, like any other writer, may be liable to be mistaken, through carelessness or prejudice; yet, on all principles of common sense, each of these his statements respecting the authorship of the various Gospels, is worth all the adverse conjectures of modern "destructive" critics put together. For Eusebius lived above fifteen hundred years nearer to New Testament times than these critics, and had come to man's estate within two hundred years of the publication of the fourth Gospel. And, besides this, Eusebius was acquainted with a vast mass of ecclesiastical literature, which has altogether perished, and the greater part of which is only known to have existed through notices or extracts to be found in his book. For instance, in a few pages he gives accounts of writings which he had seen of Papias (iii. 39), Quadratus and Aristides (iv. 3), Hegesippus (iv. 8, 22), Tatian (iv. 16), Dionysius of Corinth (iv. 23), Pinytus (iv. 23), Philip and Modestus (iv. 25), Melito (iv. 26), Apollinaris (iv. 27), Bardesanes (iv. 30).

These are all names of writers who flourished in the first three-quarters of the second century, and I have only mentioned those whose writings Eusebius appears to have actually seen.

Between Eusebius and the close of the second century three

writers of note flourished, Cyprian, martyred in old age, A.D. 257; Hippolytus, martyred about A.D. 240; and Origen, died about A.D. 250. Origen wrote a commentary on St. John in twenty-two books, two of which have come down to us. In an index now before me I find the references of St. Cyprian to St. John's Gospel are above 200. Hippolytus also continually refers to him in the most direct manner.

But I hasten from these to three authors in the last quarter of the second century, *i.e.*, within eighty years or so of the death of St. John, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria. All these were men of culture and extensive reading. All opponents of the authority of St. John's Gospel are obliged to allow that these men quote St. John's Gospel as part of the Word of God as distinctly, and as frequently, and as reverentially as any modern author which could be named.

But it may be well not to rely upon the mere assertion of this, but show it at some length by references, so that no shadow of a doubt may linger in any reader's mind upon the matter. Irenæus wrote his principal work "Against Heresies," in the reign of Commodus, *i.e.*, between A.D. 180 and 192. In his youth he was acquainted with Polycarp, who himself remembered St. John. Irenæus knows of but four Gospels, our present four. There is a remarkable passage of his writings in which he speaks of the Gospels as being *necessarily* but four:—

"It is not possible," he writes, "that the Gospels can be either more or fewer in number than they are. For since there are four zones of the world in which we live, and four principal winds . . . . it is fitting that the Church should have four pillars . . . . He Who was manifested to men has given us the Gospel under four aspects, but bound together by one Spirit." (Bk. iii., ch. xi., sec. 8.)

The wisdom of these analogies may be questioned, but no one could possibly have cited such things by way of type or comparison, if in his youth there had been only three Gospels, and one had suddenly come to light when he was in middle life, and had slowly won its way to a place in the Quaternion, as modern critics, who place the composition of St. John in the middle of the second century, ask us to believe.

The following are clear and distinct quotations from, or reference to, St. John.

John i. 1. "In the beginning," &c.

Irenæus. "That Gospel, according to John, relates His original, effectual, and glorious generation from the Father, thus declaring: 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.'" (iii. ch. xi. sec. 8.)

John i. 10, 11. "He was in the world . . . his own received him not."

Irenæus, iii. ch. xi. sec. 2. "John, however, does himself put this matter beyond all controversy on our part when he says: 'He was in the world, and the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not. He came unto His own, and His own received Him not.'"

John i. 14. "The Word was made flesh," &c.

The references to, and reminiscences of this place are exceedingly numerous. I can only give one, Bk. iii. ch. xi. sec. 2: "The Gospel affirms plainly, that by the Word which was in the beginning with God, all things were made, which Word, he says, was made Flesh, and dwelt among us."

John i. 29. "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh," &c.

Irenæus iii. ch. x. 2. "For this is the knowledge of salvation which was wanting to them, that of the Son of God, which John made known, saying, 'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.'"

John i. 49. "Nathanael answered and saith unto him," &c.

Irenæus iii. ch. xi. sec. 6. "By whom also Nathanael, being taught, recognized Him, he to whom also the Lord bare witness that he was 'an Israelite indeed, in whom was no guile.' The Israelite recognized his King. . . . . Thou art the Son of God. Thou art the King of Israel . ."

John ii. The miracle of the turning of the water into wine.

Irenæus iii. xi. 5. "But that wine was better which the Word made from water, on the moment, and simply for the use of those who had been called to the marriage."

John iii. The words to Nicodemus, the looking by faith to the Son of Man lifted up, the declaration of the Lord respecting light coming into the world, &c., John iii. 3 21, are all quoted or alluded to by Irenæus.

John iv. 14. So Irenæus: "Since the Son of God is always one and the same, He giveth to those who believe on Him a well of water [springing up] to eternal life." (iv. ch. xxxvi. 4.)

There are nine or ten references in an index now before me to

chap. v., four to chap. vi., two to chap. vii., nine to chap. viii., four to chap. ix., two to chap. xi. One of these to John xi. 54 is: "Then when He raised Lazarus from the dead, and plots were formed against Him by the Pharisees, He withdrew to a city called Ephraim, and from that place, as it is written, He came to Bethany six days before the Passover." (ii. ch. xxii. 3.)

We next come to Tertullian. He, as Irenæus, held only four Gospels, in enumerating which he puts John the first. "Of the Apostles, therefore, John and Matthew first instil faith into us; whilst of Apostolic men, Luke and Mark renew it afterwards." ("Against Marcion," iv. ch. ii., also ch. v.) Again, speaking of the full revelation of Divine Truth to the Apostles: "Was anything, moreover, hidden from John, the most beloved of the Lord, who leaned upon His breast, to whom alone the Lord pointed out beforehand Judas, that should betray Him, whom He commended unto Mary as a son in His own stead?" (On Prescription, ch. xxii.) I can only give a few references. "It is written, 'To them that believed on Him, gave He the power to be called sons of God.'" (On Prayer, ch. ii.) But it will suffice to refer to chapters xxi. to xxv. of his treatise against Praxeas, in which he shows by a minute analysis of St. John's Gospel, that the Father and the Son are constantly spoken of as distinct Persons.

"First of all, there comes at once to hand the preamble of John to his Gospel, which shows us what He previously was Who had to become flesh. 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God,' &c. . . . . His glory was beheld, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father . . . . He affirmed Himself that they were quite right in their convictions; for he answered Nathanael, 'Because I said I saw thee under the fig tree,' &c. When He entered the Temple He called it His Father's house. . . . . In His address to Nicodemus He says, 'God so loved the world,' &c. Moreover, when John was asked what he happened to know of Jesus, he said, 'The Father loveth the Son,' &c. . . . . Whom, indeed, did He reveal to the woman of Samaria? Was it not the Messias which is called Christ? . . . . He says, therefore, 'My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me, and to finish His Work;' whilst to the Jews respecting the cure of the impotent man, he remarks, 'My Father worketh hitherto and I work.' 'My Father and I;' these are the Son's words: and it was on this very account that 'the Jews sought the more intently to kill Him, not only because He broke the Sabbath, but also because He said that God was His

Father, making Himself equal with God.'" All these are from one or two pages, so that no one can have the shadow of a doubt respecting Tertullian's view of St. John's Gospel.

We now turn to Clement of Alexandria, who became head of the Catechetical School of Alexandria in A.D. 190. He also knows of but four Gospels, for speaking of a saying ascribed to our Lord, he writes, "In the first place, then, in the four Gospels handed down amongst us, we have not this saying; but in that which is according to the Egyptians." (Miscellanies, iii. 13.)

Clement gives an account of the writing of the fourth Gospel as follows:—He says that those which contain the genealogies were written first, but that the Gospel of St. John was occasioned in the following manner:—"But John, last of all, perceiving that what had reference to the body in the Gospel of our Saviour was sufficiently detailed, and being encouraged by his familiar friends, and urged by the Spirit, he wrote a Spiritual Gospel" (Extracted by Eusebius from Hypotyposes, Eccles. Hist. vi. 14.). The following are a few references out of very many:—

John i. 1. "In the beginning was the Word," &c.

Clement, Exhortation to Heathen, chap. i. "Do not suppose the song of salvation to be new, as a vessel or a house is new, for . . . . 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.'"

John i. 17. "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came," &c.

Clement, Instructor, i. 7. "Wherefore it [the law] was only temporary; but eternal grace and truth were by Jesus Christ."

John i. 2, x. 11. Clement, Instructor, i. 11. "With authority of utterance, for He is God and Creator, for 'all things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made;' and with benevolence, for He alone gave Himself a sacrifice for us, 'for the Good Shepherd giveth His Life for the sheep.'"

John i. 18. "No man hath seen God at any time," &c.

Clement, Miscellanies, v. 12. "And John the Apostle says: 'No man hath seen God at any time. The only begotten God [very old reading], who is in the bosom of the Father,'" &c.

John iii. 18. "He that believeth not, is condemned already," &c.

Clement, Miscell. iv. 26. "He that believeth not is, according to the utterance of the Saviour, condemned already."

Also, Miscell. vi. 11. "'I must decrease,' saith the prophet John."

Miscell. i. 6. "As the Lord taught to worship in spirit." Instructor, i. 6. "I," says the Lord, "have meat to eat that ye know not of." Instructor, i. 6, "Further, the Word declares Himself to be the bread of heaven. 'For Moses,' He says, 'gave you not that bread from heaven, but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven,'" &c.

Such are the testimonies of Irenæus, Tertullian, and Clement to the fact of there having been, within their memory, only four Gospels, and that one of these is that of St. John, exactly as we now possess it. These men were all men of letters, of extensive reading, and deep thought. They lived in the most opposite parts of the world—Tertullian in Africa, Irenæus in Gaul, Clement in Alexandria. They were all writing, or had written, about 190. They all witness distinctly to the fact that St. John's Gospel had been accepted by the Church, not only at the time they wrote, but always—from the first. Now let us consider, for what period could they speak on such a subject with certainty? Most assuredly for above a century. One of them, Irenæus, remembered well the teaching of Polycarp, who himself remembered, and spoke of having seen, St. John. If, at the end of the century, they were between sixty and seventy, or even younger, they could have conversed with Christians—aged men, of course—who were contemporary with St. John, or who were born within a few years after his death. Such men could, and do, vouch with absolute certainty for the fact that, during their whole life-time, and as far back as the memory of their immediate fathers extended, no Gospel purporting to be written by the Apostle St. John, and not really written by him, could have been palmed upon the Church as his: and not only palmed upon the Church, but appealed to as the standard of the Church on the matter of a doctrine of such supreme importance as the Divine Nature of her Head, and also read in her assemblies gathered together for the celebration of her highest worship.

Let the reader remember that the fourth Gospel was professedly received by the Church, not for its intrinsic merits, but for its presumed authenticity as the genuine work of an Apostle to whom was given the Spirit of God, to guide him into all the truth. Its statements of doctrine were received as being as much above mere human approval as above criticism, simply because they were Apostolic.

Let the reader try to imagine any book of the very highest authority received everywhere as authentic in the year 1883, and purporting to be written between 1780 and 1790, by the foremost man

of his day in the society or sect to which he belonged, but, in fact, not seeing the light till 1840 or so, and being, in reality, a forgery by some absolutely obscure and unknown man, using the name of the said celebrated man, who died before the end of the last century; the book so forged establishing itself, without a word of surprise, or opposition, or inquiry; and without a word of explanation as to why it had remained so long in the dark!

Surely, absurdity could scarcely go further; but no, we have it in our power to imagine it going much further. Let us suppose a book, actually written in 1780, received by the Church or society to which the author belonged, and of which he was then the virtual head, as a standard of appeal, commented on and read in public as one out of four most important books, and reckoned amongst these four because of its presumed authorship, but, by some revolutionary catastrophe, the vast mass of the literature available for tracing its use for the first one hundred years of its existence perishing, except a few scraps; and critics 1,800 years hence (in A.D. 3600), thrusting aside as worthless the testimony of learned and credible witnesses in 1883, taking no account of their reiterated appeals to it as a genuine work, always accepted by the Church as her standard, making nothing of the fact that, to all appearance, it had attained to the highest position, unchallenged and unquestioned, calmly laying down that the Church had not only been imposed upon by an unknown author, but that she was under the impression that, since the time of its publication, she had received the book, and read it in public as authoritative, whilst, in point of fact, she had done no such thing; but the whole body of the Church were blindly, and we must say wilfully, deceived on a matter which touched the very existence of their society, as a society founded for holding and disseminating the truth of God.

If anyone asserts this to be a caricature, I deny it; and I ask such a person to consider what is implied in the ignoring of such a witness as Irenæus. It assumes that Irenæus had himself lost all memory of what had occurred in his own lifetime, and that he took not the slightest interest in the truth of the history of the events of the society of which he was an office-bearer, so as to inquire of his older brethren or fathers of what had occurred within their memory. For the addition of another Gospel to the three, the completion of the Quaternion, was a thing of portentous importance, and could not have occurred unnoticed in a society which long hesitated about

the admission of Epistles, such as that of St. James and that to the Hebrews, into the number of their sacred books.

There is yet remaining to be examined another writer, Justin Martyr, living in the middle of the second century. It is, as is well known, the peculiarity of this author that, though quoting the four Gospels as the Memoirs of the Apostles, he never cites them by name. It is most certain that he knows and refers to the four, for he clearly distinguishes between the books as being written, not only by the Apostles, but "by those that followed them." And he writes thus, making this distinction, when he is speaking of our Lord's Bloody Sweat, of which we have the account, not in a Gospel written by an Apostle, but by the follower of an Apostle, *i.e.*, by St. Luke (Dial. ciii.).

The following are references more or less distinct to the fourth Gospel, in the order in which they appear in Justin :—

(1.) Apology, I. xxii. "In that we say that He made whole the paralytic and those born blind, we seem to say," &c. St. John, alone of the Evangelists, mentions the restoring of sight to one *born* blind (John ix. 32).

(2.) Apol. I. xxxii. "And the first Power, after God the Father and Lord of all, is the Word, who is also the Son; and of Him we will, in what follows, relate how He took flesh, and became Man." This is a free reproduction for the use of the heathen of John i. 1 and 14.

(3.) Apol. I. xxxiii. "For things which were incredible and impossible with men, these God predicted as about to come to pass, in order that, when they came to pass, there might be no unbelief, but faith," &c.—a clear reminiscence of John xiii. 19.

(4.) Apol. I. lxi. He thus describes baptism to the heathen: "Then they are brought by us where there is water, and are regenerated in the same manner in which we ourselves were regenerated. . . . . For Christ also said, 'Except ye be born again, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.' Now, that it is impossible for those who have once been born to enter into their mother's womb, is manifest to all." A clearer reference to John iii. 3-5 cannot be conceived.

(5.) Apol. I. lxvi. Speaking of the Eucharist, he writes: "In like manner as Jesus Christ our Saviour, having been made flesh by the Word of God, hath both flesh and blood for our salvation, so likewise have we been taught that the food which is blessed by the prayer of His Word . . . . is the flesh and blood of that Jesus

Who was made flesh." The three Synoptics, in speaking of the first Eucharistic element, report that the Lord said, "This is my body." Our Lord alone, in John vi., speaks of it as *flesh*; so that Justin here plainly has John vi. before him.

(6.) Apol. II. x. "For no one trusted in Socrates, so as to die for his doctrine, but in Christ, Who was partially known even by Socrates (for He was and is the Word Who is in every man) .... not only philosophers and scholars believed," &c. Justin would not have written this if he had not had in his mind John i. 9: "That was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world."

(7.) Apol. II. xiii. "The Word Who is from the Unbegotten and Ineffable, since also He became man for our sakes"—a reminiscence of John i. 14.

(8.) Dialogue xvii. "Accordingly, you displayed great zeal in publishing throughout all the land bitter, and dark, and unjust things against the only blameless and righteous Light sent by God." In St. John only is our Lord called the "Light."

(9.) Dial. xxvii. "For, tell me, did God wish the priests to sin when they offer the sacrifices on the Sabbath? or those to sin who are circumcised, or do sacrifice on the Sabbaths, since He commands that on the eighth day, even though it happen on a Sabbath, those who are born shall always be circumcised?"—a clear reminiscence of John vii. 22, 23.

(10.) Dial. xxviii. "But though a man be a Scythian or a Persian, if he has the knowledge of God and of His Christ," &c. The knowledge of God and of Christ are only thus associated in John xvii. 3, "Know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ."

(11.) Dial. xxxiv. "For Christ is King and Priest and God and Lord." The two Divine titles, God and Lord, are in the New Testament never together applied to Christ, except in John xx. 28; see also Dial. cxxviii. and cxxix., "The cause of His power, and of His being Lord and God."

(12.) Dial. lvi. "For I affirm that He has never at any time done anything which He Who made the world, above Whom there is no other God, has not wished Him both to do and to engage Himself with"—a clear reminiscence of that unity of will and action between the Father and the Son which pervades St. John; see, particularly, John iv. 34, vi. 38, xii. 49, xiv. 31.

Also Dial. lvi. "He announces to men, whatsoever the Maker of

all things, above Whom there is no God, wishes to announce to them" ("I have declared unto them Thy word").

(13.) Dial. lxi. "Who is called by the Holy Spirit, now the glory of the Lord, now the Son, again Wisdom, again an Angel, then God, and then Lord and Logos." Our Lord is called by the Holy Spirit by the three last names only in St. John: God and Lord, John xx. 28; Logos, John i. 1.

(14.) Dial. lxi. "This God, begotten of the Father of all things, and Word, and Wisdom, and Power, and the Glory of the Begetter," &c. "God begotten" seems a clear reminiscence of the very old, if not original, reading, "God only begotten, Who is in the bosom of the Father," of John i. 18.

(15.) Dial. lxii. "But this Offspring, which was truly brought forth from the Father, was with the Father before all the creatures, and the Father communed with Him." So John i. 1, 2, and John xvii., throughout.

(16.) Dial. lxiv. "You remember from other words spoken by David . . . how that it is declared that He should come forth from the highest heavens, and again return to the same places." Justin would never have found this in David, unless he had first learnt it from John vi. 42, xiii. 3, xvi. 28.

(17.) Dial. lxix. "The spring of living water which gushed forth from God" (John iv.).

This is no more than a slight reminiscence; but the term "living water," whether applied to Christ or to the Spirit, is only used in St. John. But with this should be read—

(18.) Dial. cxiv. "We are happy to die for the Name of the good Rock, which causes living water to burst forth for the hearts of those who by Him have loved the Father of all, and which gives those who are willing to drink of the water of life."

(19.) Dial. lxxxviii. "Men supposed him [John the Baptist] to be Christ; but he cried unto them, 'I am not the Christ, but the voice of one crying'"—a clear quotation of John i. 20 and 23.

(20.) Dial. xciv. "God . . . caused the brazen serpent to be made by Moses in the wilderness . . . by this He proclaimed the mystery, by which He declared that He would break the power of the serpent which occasioned the transgression of Adam, and would bring to them that believe on Him by this sign—*i.e.*, Him Who was to be crucified, salvation from the fangs of the serpent," &c. John

iii. is the one only place in Scripture where the brazen serpent is said to be a type of Christ on the Cross.

(21.) Dial. c. "Being about to rise again from the dead on the third day after the crucifixion; and this He has obtained from the Father." There cannot be the slightest doubt that Justin here refers to John x. 18: "I have power to take it [My Life] again. This commandment have I received of my Father."

(22.) Dial. ci. "He [Christ] boasts not in accomplishing anything through His own will or might"—a reproduction of John v. 30: "I can of mine own self do nothing;" also vi. 38.

(23.) Dial. cxxvii. "Therefore neither Abraham, nor Isaac, nor Jacob, nor any other man saw the Father and ineffable Lord of all . . . but saw Him Who was, according to His will, His Son"—a clear amplification of John i. 18: "No man hath seen God," &c.

(24.) Dial. cxxxvi. "For He who knows not Him, knows not the will of God; and he who insults and hates Him, insults and hates Him that sent Him. And whosoever believes not on Him, believes not the declarations of the prophets, who preached and proclaimed Him to all"—a reproduction or amalgamation of several passages in St. John, as v. 46, xv. 21 and 23, and perhaps vii. 17.

(25.) Dial. cxxxvii. "Assent, therefore, and pour no ridicule on *the Son of God;* obey not the Pharisaic teachers, and scoff not at *the King of Israel*." This parallelism in Justin is the reminiscence and exact counterpart of Nathanael's, in John i. 49.

In estimating the significance of these places in their bearing on the authenticity of St. John's Gospel, we must first remember that Justin was a contemporary of Irenæus. He suffered martyrdom about the year A.D. 165, only fifteen years before Irænеus wrote his book upon Heresies. The dates of the births of Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria are uncertain; but it is most probable that the former was approaching, and the latter had arrived at, man's estate before this date (165). It is impossible, then, to imagine that the Gospels, as a Quaternion, as four in number, should be unknown to Justin; whilst Irenæus, his contemporary, speaks of the four Gospels as being such a necessity "that they can be neither more nor less in number than they are."

It is difficult to understand how anyone can believe that a Gospel existing in 160, but not acknowledged to be St. John's composition (indeed, not believed to be his), should, in the year 180, be universally accepted as of Apostolic origin, much less that a Gospel,

unknown to one of the first Christians of the day in 160, should, in 180, be believed, not only to have been the work of St. John, but to have always been received as his; for the three statements of Irenæus, Tertullian, and Clement, which I have given in pages xiii., xiv., and xv., all require that, so far as their memories, and the memories of those with whom they came in contact, could testify, four Gospels—no more and no less—had been received by the Church.

The Christian reader will probably be astonished to hear that all the seeming references to St. John's Gospel in Justin which I have just given are one after another denied to be such, and it is attempted to be shown that each one *may* be ascribed to some imaginary tradition, to some Apocryphal Gospel, to some ingenious piecing together of hints, and scraps, and disjointed sentences from the Synoptics, and the lost Gospel of the Hebrews, &c. Conjectures and suppositions are made to stand for facts, and the conclusion is that Justin need not have so much as seen in St. John's Gospel, and that if he saw it he did not acknowledge it to be St. John's writing; and it is asserted that the Theology and Christology of Justin is prior in development to that of the Gospel; so that the fourth Gospel MAY have been written and imposed on the Catholic Church as late as between 160 and 180, that is, in the lifetime of the father (Irenæus) who looked upon its existence as a necessity. Now, let the reader turn to Nos. 4, 5, 19, 20, 21, and 25 of the preceding list, and say whether it is reasonable to grope in the dark for the source of these sayings in unknown traditions or Apocryphal Gospels, when a Gospel well known to the contemporaries of the writer contains them. Justin Martyr's habit, be it remembered, being rather to reproduce freely the sense than to quote, simply because all his writings which have come down to us are for the use of those without the pale of the Church, and for such persons it is more intelligible to give the sense freely than to quote accurately. Such reproductions and reminiscences as those I have given are in one sense far more valuable than quotations, for they prove that the man who uses them has not merely read the Gospel in question, but has fed upon it and assimilated it. Indeed, the whole Christology of Justin is not that of the Synoptics, but of the fourth Gospel. I give two instances out of very many. "To the Father of all, Who is unbegotten, there is no name given. . . . And His Son, Who alone is properly called Son, the Word, Who was also with Him, and was

begotten before the works, when at first He created and arranged all things, by Him, is called Christ in reference to His being anointed, and God's ordering all things through Him." (Apol. ii. ch, vi.) And again: "The first power after God the Father, and Lord of all, is the Word, Who is also the Son: and of Him we will, in what follows, relate how He took flesh and became Man." (Apol. i. 32.)

This witness of Justin carries us to the times of St. John himself, for every old man with whom Justin would converse about the Christian faith would be a contemporary of St. John. But it is useless to dwell further on this matter. Men who make nothing of the witness of Irenæus, and Clement of Alexandria, will naturally reject that of Justin, and they do.

With the exception of Justin Martyr, the remains of the writers between the time of Irenæus and the commencement of the second century are very scanty and fragmentary.

Theophilus of Antioch, about A.D. 180, was a contemporary of Irenæus. In his Epistle to Autolycus (ii. 22), there is a remarkable passage, in which, after asserting that the Lord God, Who walked in the garden of Eden, and talked with Adam, was the Son, he goes on to say, "The holy writings teach us, and all the Spirit-bearing (inspired) men, one of whom, John, says, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God,' showing that at first God was alone, and the Word in Him. Then he says 'the Word was God: All things come into existence through Him, and apart from Him not one thing came into existence.'"

Athenagoras also, five or six years earlier, and so also a contemporary of Irenæus, quotes St. John. "But the Son of God is the Logos of the Father in idea and in operation; for after the pattern of Him, and by Him, were all things made, and the Father and the Son being one." Plea (or Embassy) for the Christians, ch. x.

The Muratorian fragment about A.D. 173-180, also in the time of Irenæus, ascribes this Gospel to a "John of the disciples," "Joanna ex discipulis" In the Epistle of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons, given in full in Eusebius, bk. v. ch. i., there is a clear quotation from John xvi. 2.

Tatian, also, between Irenæus and Justin, distinctly quotes St. John. The reader will see these quotations with the indications of the knowledge of the fourth Gospel in the Epistle to Diognetus, in the Shepherd of Hermas, and in Papias. treated at length in Luthardt's "St. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel."

Lastly, Ignatius could not have derived such a passage as the following, except from the Gospel or the oral teaching of St. John: "I desire the bread of God . . . . which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, Who was of the seed of David, and I desire as a drink His Blood, which is love incorruptible, and eternal life." (Epistle to Romans.)

In conclusion, I would notice that no false Gospel pretending to be the work of St. John, could possibly have been imposed on the Church during the survival of his contemporaries, and they could not have become extinct till nearly the middle of the second century. If it had been composed as late as 140, there were multitudes living then who could have risen up and said, "We never heard the Apostle, on whose lips we hung, teach such things. We never heard him speak of the turning of water into wine, or of the discourse with Nicodemus, or of the woman at the well, or of the man at the pool of Bethesda, much less did we hear him teach the discourses which this forger has impudently fabricated." So that the publication of the Gospel, if a forgery, cannot be put before 140, to which period there extends back the personal memories of Irenæus, who certainly speaks as if St. John's Gospel had always been venerated in the Church.

Such is the external evidence. The reader must remember that no book written by any heathen author has one-fiftieth of the evidence for its authenticity which can be adduced in favour of St. John's Gospel.

The internal evidence is of the strongest. The Gospel must have been written by an eye-witness. No one who had not been present could have given such a graphic account of the call of the four disciples as we have in the first chapter. The whole of the second and third chapters bear all the marks of being from the pen of one who himself saw and heard what he there recounts. The seventh, eighth, ninth, and eleventh chapters witness to the same fact. But these unmistakable indications of the presence of the narrator at the scenes he describes culminate in the thirteenth. No man, except for a purpose, can possibly assert that the contents of that chapter were invented after the death of the last person who took part in the scenes there described.

Another, and to my mind, overwhelming reason why this Gospel is to be held to be the production (under the Holy Spirit) of the last surviving Apostle, is the manifest fact that it is so different from the Synoptics in the incidents which it records, and in the discourses which it attributes to our Lord. In the face of the pre-

valence of the Synoptic tradition it is impossible to imagine that the Church would have received such a document, except from the hands of the last surviving Apostle.

THE PURPOSE FOR WHICH THIS GOSPEL WAS WRITTEN.

The next matter to be considered is the purpose of St. John (or rather of the Spirit Who inspired him), in writing this Gospel. He himself distinctly tells us what this was, in the last words of the Gospel itself (for chapter xxi. is an appendix by his own hand): "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through His Name." It is true that the signs mentioned in the preceding verse are rather the appearances after the Resurrection, but what is true of them, is equally true of the whole manifestation of Jesus throughout the book. The Gospel throughout, on the face of it, reveals this one purpose and no other. It commences with the Revelation of the Son of God in His pre-existing state, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God," and it concludes with Jesus receiving the confession, "My Lord and My God," of the disciple the slowest to believe.

Every discourse and every incident bears more or less directly on His Nature as a Divine Nature, and His works as Divine works.

In the first chapter John witnesses to Him as One standing amongst men Whom they knew not (26), as having been before him, as One Whose shoe's latchet he was not worthy to unloose (27), as One Who baptized with the Holy Ghost (33). In the second chapter He appears as the Son of God cleansing His Father's house (16), as Himself raising up the temple of His body after it was destroyed (19), as knowing what was in man (25). In the third He speaks of Himself as having come down from Heaven, and yet being in Heaven (13), as the only Begotten Son of God, sent into the world to be the object of saving faith (16), as Light come into the world (19), as the Bridegroom or Husband of the Church of God (29), as receiving the Spirit without measure (34), as having received all things at the hand of God (35). In the fourth He declares Himself to be the Giver of the living water—that is, of the Spirit

of God (10). In the fifth as One working co-ordinately with His Father, of Whom He is the Equal, though He does nothing without Him (18), as doing all that the Father does (19), as receiving honour equal to that of the Father (23), as at this present time raising the soul from the death of sin to the life of righteousness (25), and as at the last day calling all that are in the graves to come forth and receive just retribution at His hands (28, 29), and yet of His own self doing nothing, as seeking not His own will (30), or bearing witness to Himself, but as receiving witness from the Father (32), and from the Scriptures (39). In the sixth chapter as giving the Meat which endureth unto everlasting life (27), as being Himself the Bread of immortality (48), as making His very Flesh the means by which men are to receive from Him eternal life (51), as possessing that astonishing spiritual attribute of God, that men, no matter in what part of the world they may be, may be in Him and He in them, just as God can be in them and they in God (56). In the seventh chapter He again sets forth belief in Himself as the occasion of a man's receiving the Holy Ghost in such abundance that he shall be a fountain of life to those about him (38). In the eighth chapter He is the Light of the World (12), He gives the true freedom of spirit to those who continue in His word (31-36). He proceeds and comes from God (42), He says words which if a man keep he shall never see death (51), He is able to say respecting His own eternal existence, "Before Abraham was, I am" (58). In the ninth chapter we have Him calling upon one to believe in Him as the Son of God, and as such receiving his worship (35-38). In the tenth He appears as the Shepherd of the new and better Israel (11-14), He being to them and they to Him as Israel of old was to Jehovah; as knowing the Father as the Father knows Him (15), as having other sheep (16), as giving to His sheep eternal life (28), and as saying that He and His Father are One, and so drawing upon Himself the charge of blasphemy (30), and as repeating it in saying that the Father is in Him, and He in the Father (38). In the eleventh chapter He requires belief in Himself as the Resurrection and the Life, so that whosoever believeth in Him shall never die (25, 26). In the twelfth chapter He prophesies that if He be lifted up He will draw all men unto Himself (32), and the Evangelist witnesses of Him that it was His glory in His pre-existent state that Isaiah saw in the temple of God in the midst of the Seraphim (41). In the thirteenth, He into Whose hands the Father

had committed all things, and Who came from God and went to Him again, humbled Himself to wash his disciples' feet, saying to them, "Ye call Me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am" (3-13). In the fourteenth, He sets Himself forth side by side with God as the Object of faith (1), He speaks of His Oneness with the Father in such terms as "If ye had known Me, ye should have known my Father also" (7), "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father" (9), He proclaims His Mediatorship in the terms, "If ye ask any thing in My Name, I will do it" (14), and He utters such a promise as, "Because I live, ye shall live also" (19), He engages that the Father shall send the Comforter in His [Christ's] Name (26), and in words which acknowledge the priority of the Father as being a Father, He says, "My Father is greater than I." In the fifteenth chapter the Lord declares that all good works pleasing to God are done by Christians through a vital and mysterious union with Himself of such a sort that the fittest way of describing it is as the union betwixt a branch of a vine and its parent stem (1-7). He speaks of men keeping His commandments and so abiding in His love (10), of having chosen His disciples and ordained them that they should bring forth fruit, and that their fruit should remain (16), and that He Himself would send the Holy Ghost from the Father to testify of Him (26). In the sixteenth chapter He again engages Himself to send the Comforter, Who will convince the world of sin because they do not believe in Him (7, 8), and will glorify Him by taking of what belongs to Him, and showing it to the souls of the disciples (14). In the seventeenth chapter He asks the Father to glorify Him with the glory which He had with Him before the world was (5); and in the twentieth chapter He gives to those whom He sent the power to remit and retain sins (23), and receives from one of them his confession of faith in Him in the words, "My Lord and my God," and approves of it as the faith due to Him (28, 29).

But the Apostle's design is not only that his readers should believe that Jesus is the Son of God, but is "the Christ, the Son of God." The Son of God is represented all through the Gospel as coming from the bosom of the Father to be the Christ, the Anointed Man Whom all the prophets had led the Jews to expect. He comes to be the Revealer of the Unseen God in an outward and visible form of Flesh and Blood. In this form He speaks the words of God, He does the works of God, He exhibits so perfectly the mind

and character of God, that when men saw Him they saw God, when men heard Him they heard God, when men knew Him they knew God. The title Christ implies the human servant sent, set apart, anointed, to do the redeeming and reconciling work, but not as a mere servant, a Moses, a David, an Isaiah, but the Son in the form of a servant. Being the Christ, He is "of man." Being the Son of God, He is "of God." Thus He is set forth in this Gospel as perfectly human and perfectly Divine; but the human deified by the Divine, and the Divine known, and seen, and understood in the human.

But there is a further purpose, "that believing ye might have life through His Name." This Gospel is especially the Gospel of Life. It begins, "In Him was Life," and "To as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God;" *i.e.*, by receiving a new life, a new birth of God. Then we have in it such declarations as, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." "The water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life." He remonstrates with the Jews in such words as, "Ye will not come unto Me that ye might have life." He says, "I am that Bread of Life." "The bread that I will give is my Flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." "Whoso eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood hath everlasting life." "He that followeth Me shall have the light of life." "I am come that they might have life." "I am the Resurrection and the Life," "Whoso liveth and believeth in Me shall never die." "I am the Way, the Truth, and the *Life*." "Because I live, ye shall live also."

Such is the purpose of the fourth Gospel, expressed by the Evangelist himself, and borne out by almost every page of his Gospel.

It is clear that such is the greatness of this revelation of the Person and Office of the Son of God, and of the life derived from Him to us, that this Gospel can have no other purpose, for this reason, that all must be immeasurably subordinate to this, so that any other design of the Evangelist can scarcely be named beside this.

Two other purposes, however, have been ascribed to the Evangelist, one by the earliest Fathers, another by late modern writers. (1.) That by the Fathers is that the Evangelist wrote his Gospel to refute certain heretics. Thus Irenæus: "John the disciple of Jesus preaches this faith, and seeks by the proclamation of the Gospel to remove that error which by Cerinthus has been disseminated among men, and a long time previously by those termed Nicolaitanes, who are an offset of that 'knowledge' falsely so called, that he might confound

them, and persuade men that there is but one God, Who made all things by His Word: and not, as they allege, that the Creator was One, but the Father of the Lord Another, and that the Son of the Creator was, forsooth, One, but the Christ from above Another, Who also continued impassible, descending upon Jesus ths Son of the Creator, and flew back again to His Pleroma." (Bk. iii. xi. 1.)

This seems perfectly true if we hold steadily to the fact that John seeks to remove these and kindred errors by, as Irenæus says, "the preaching of the faith," and "the proclamation of the Gospel;" for this Gospel does not read like a polemical treatise, but meets error, which is always one-sided, by the proclamation of the full and perfect truth. All the deadly errors respecting our Blessed Lord seem to come from two sources—the attempts to lower His Divine Nature, which culminate in humanitarianism, which is, that He is a mere man; and the attempt to do away with His human nature. The latter is the ancient Docetic error, which would make our Lord's Body to be not a true Body, but a phantom. This Gospel, on the contrary, sets Him forth as very Man. "The Word was made flesh." When in the flesh He hungered and thirsted, and was weary, and wept tears of sympathy, and groaned in the spirit, and at last surrendered His Soul in death; and after death, when He rose from the dead in His spiritual Body, that Body, so far from being a phantom Body, could be felt and touched, and even receive food.

The former source of errors, that which would lower or destroy the Divine in our Lord, is throughout this Gospel met by such statements as "The Word was God," "He said that God was His own Father, making Himself equal with God," and St. Thomas's confession, "My Lord and my God."

But it is interesting to observe how, without alluding to it, this Gospel meets an absurd form of bygone heresy by the simple statement of the counter truth. One of the most widespread Gnostical errors, alluded to in the above passage of Irenæus, was that Jesus was not the Son of the God of the Old Testament, but in reality was of a different descent, and came to destroy His power. Now no one can read this Gospel without noticing how earnestly the Son of God asserts His subordination to His Father, how he does nothing except what He sees the Father do; how He judges nothing, and teaches nothing, except what His Father has given to Him to do and to teach (v. 19, 30); and, whilst very broadly asserting the difference in their personality (viii. 18), He yet pro-

claims His Unity with His Father in such terms as "I and my Father are One," "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." This He did for the sake of His countrymen, the Jews. If He claimed to Himself Divine attributes, which He did, He was bound to show that His claims to possess these attributes in no way interfered with the Unity of the Divine Nature, which it was the especial mission of the Jews to uphold. But in thus asserting His Oneness with the Father in will and in action, so as to remove all misapprehension from His countrymen, the Lord asserted what was absolutely incompatible with the insane dreams of Gnosticism, for He seemed to seek for occasion to proclaim His relation to the God of the Old Testament as His Son, His Very Son, Who partook of His Nature, and a Son Who was ever One with His Father in will, and came not to please or glorify Himself, but His Father. Let the reader notice how completely this refutes the idea that the Fourth Gospel was the product of the second century, when Gnosticism was at its height. If it had been written in the second century it would have met such forms of error directly, it would have stated them and exposed them on their own grounds, whereas throughout this Gospel the antidote to these errors is our Lord's repeated assertions that He does nothing and says nothing apart from His Father; these assertions being given by Him for a manifestly different purpose, viz., to remove misconceptions from the minds of His countrymen that in the smallest degree He set Himself forth as a separate and independent God.

2. A second purpose has, by many leading modern expositors, (particularly Godet) been ascribed to St. John in writing this Gospel, which is, to trace side by side the progress of belief and unbelief —of belief in the Apostles, of unbelief in the chosen people. I am constrained to say that I cannot see any such purpose. There does not seem any progress in the belief of the Apostles after St. Peter's confession early in the history in chap. vi.: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe, and are sure that Thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God" (or the Holy One of God). The Lord had made the greatest demand upon their faith that He ever had made, or ever did make, that His Flesh and Blood were to be received by men if they would enjoy eternal life. He had vouchsafed no explanation of this "hard saying." Many who were His disciples ceased to follow Him, but the twelve, or rather the eleven, showed not only faith, but implicit

faith. Nothing more is said of their faith till the end of the discourse on the way to Gethsemane, when they confess, "Now are we sure that Thou knowest all things, and needest not that any man should ask Thee, by this we believe that Thou camest forth from God." To which the Lord rejoins, "Do ye now [or ye do now] believe? Behold the hour cometh, yea is now come, that ye shall be scattered every man to his own, and shall leave Me alone" (xvi. 32). As if He said, "Ye believe, it is true, but your faith is miserably weak, for ye shall all forsake Me, and flee." Then the chapter on the Resurrection, and the appearances consequent upon it, are actually said to be written to show the triumph of faith in the Apostles. So that, literally, according to some, the manifestations of the Risen Person of the Eternal Son are subordinated to the manifestation of certain phases of internal consciousness in poor human beings. But is it possible to believe this when we consider that not one of the Apostles, except St. John, believed till he saw? "Then were the disciples glad when they *saw* the Lord," records no triumph of faith, of that faculty which is "the evidence of things not seen." Mary Magdalene, the very moment before He manifested Himself to her, believed that His Body had been removed by the gardener. The most unreserved confession of our Lord's Godhead was made by St. Thomas, but the Lord evidently considers it to be anything but triumphant when He says, "Because thou hast seen Me, thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed." As I have noticed before (St. Matthew, p. 470), there is something exceedingly mysterious in the slowness of the Apostles to believe in the Resurrection. It was undoubtedly supernatural, "This saying was hid from them" (Luke xviii. 34). God apparently withheld His secret assistance, so that the Lord's repeated prophecies of His own Resurrection, and the sight of the resurrection of Lazarus, failed to work such faith in them as to lead them to expect His Resurrection, or to accept the first news of it from the women. We now, in this nineteenth century, discern the wisdom of God in this slowness to believe on the part of the Apostles. It is recorded to show that the Apostles, and even the women, were not weak, superstitious visionaries expecting to see something, and so seeing it—fancying that they beheld the Risen Lord, and then imagining their fancies to be realities.

Much less was this Gospel written to trace the growth of unbelief among the Jews. There may be an increase in the determination of

the High Priests and rulers not to believe, but I do not see that there is any marked progress of unbelief from the fifth chapter to the end. There is a marked increase of envy and malignity, but not of unbelief. The rulers seem determined from the first, so that the only single one among them who ventures to come for instruction, can only come by night; the common people are uncertain, sometimes appearing to side with the Lord, sometimes questioning and wavering.

It seems futile to attempt to trace this unbelief during our Lord's Lifetime, when we know that after Pentecost the most determined of His foes might become the sincerest of His friends, so as even to suffer death for His sake. It is surprising how commentators fail to realize that in the case of One who put forth such superhuman claims as those which our Lord did, indifference showed a far worse moral nature than opposition. A sincere but prejudiced and ignorant Jew might be shocked at such words as, "Before Abraham was, I am," and "I and My Father are one," and take up stones to stone the supposed blasphemer, and even deny that any miracles could make such claims valid: and yet after Pentecost be converted to Christ. It was opposition to the witness of the Spirit and of the Church which finally sealed the doom of the nation.

RELATION OF ST. JOHN TO THE SYNOPTICS.

A few words in conclusion are required on the relation of this Gospel to the three Synoptical ones.

Though seemingly opposed to one another they are, in fact, not only not divergent, but complementary, the fourth Gospel supplying throughout the answer to most important questions which the Synoptical narratives suggest but do not solve.

1. And first, at the outset, the fourth Gospel answers a difficulty respecting the call of the Apostles themselves. From the Synoptic narratives we should gather that the four principal ones were called suddenly, without any previous preparation or discipline (Matth. iv. 18-19). From St. John we gather that these men had been previously so affected by the teaching of the Baptist that they had become his disciples, and were looking for the Messiah. And when John pointed Him out to them as the Lamb of God, then they left

John, and for a time followed Jesus, and when He called them to give up all and follow Him, they readily obeyed, so well had John prepared the way for Jesus in their hearts, so well had they profited by their short previous converse with the Lord, so deeply had such miracles as that of Cana wrought faith in them.

2. Then in this Gospel we have the reason for the Institution of the Sacraments of Baptism and of the Lord's Supper. In the Synoptics we have the Lord instituting two outward rites or signs, but no spiritual promise connected with them. In St. John we have set forth the inward and spiritual grace of each. Of Baptism, in that it is an entrance into the kingdom of God through a new Birth of water and of the Spirit; of the Holy Communion, in that it is the means whereby we eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood in order that we may have His Life in us. In the Synoptics we have the Lord's Supper ordained in such astonishing terms as "Take eat, this is My Body. Drink ye all of it, for this is My Blood," and yet not a word of explanation as to why He should offer them His Body and Blood, and why they should receive such Things. The institution of such a rite in such terms assumes that some explanation had been given by way of preparing them, and in the discourse in the synagogue at Capernaum we have such explanation; so that the Lord instituted no mere outward typical rite, but one intended to convey Himself as the Bread of Life, which He had previously led them to expect through some reception of His Body and Blood.

3. The most obvious discrepancy between St. John and the Synoptics is that the latter seem to make the Lord begin and continue His ministry in Galilee till a very short time before His Crucifixion, and the Galilean ministry commenced after the Baptist was cast into prison; whereas St. John speaks of an earlier sojourn in Jerusalem before the imprisonment of John (see my note on Matth. iv. 12). Of this work we are not told much, the first cleansing of the Temple, and the discourse with Nicodemus being the principal incidents of the first part of it. We learn from John ii. 23, iii. 2, that this was a ministry of many miracles, and much teaching, and that many believed in His Name. It was renewed in the land of Judæa with the additional circumstance that the Lord baptized (iii. 22, iv. 1); and when the Lord had taken up His abode in Galilee, it was resumed at certain intervals at the feasts; as at a feast not named, probably Purim, in

John v., and at the feast of Tabernacles in chap. vii., and of the Dedication in ix. and x. (x. 22). Now the Synoptics make no express mention of all this; with them the Jerusalem ministry commences on Palm Sunday, five days only before the Crucifixion. But though they do not expressly mention it, it is absolutely required for the consistency of their narratives. For, in the first place, the narratives in the Synoptics give no reason for the extraordinary enmity with which our Lord was met by the chief priests and elders in Jerusalem. Their conduct betrays every mark of long-continued and deep-seated rancour which had been nursed for years. Thus they bring against Him the charge of destroying the Temple and building it in three days; now, not a syllable which could lead to such a charge had been uttered by Him in His Galilean ministry, but it was a plausible perversion of words which had been uttered by Him two years, at least, before, when He first cleansed the Temple. Again, why did the high priest at His first examination adjure Him by the Living God to tell them whether He was the Son of God? He had never openly proclaimed Himself the Son of God in the highest sense in Galilee or Perœa, but He had done so in the most open, and, to them, offensive way in the hearing of His enemies in Jerusalem (John v. 18, 25, x. 36). The four days' ministry before the Crucifixion, even though He denounced the hypocrisy of the Scribes and Pharisees (Matth. xx.), seems far too short a time to bring down upon Him such an extremity of wrath and hatred as culminated in His Crucifixion only three days afterwards on the Friday.

Again, when the Lord on His last entry into Jerusalem wept over it, St. Luke makes Him say, "If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace." Now this is totally incompatible with the supposition that He had never before ministered in Jerusalem, and was now about to do so for the first time. It is only consistent with many miracles and many appeals: and so in St. Matthew we have Him, the day after this, apostrophizing the devoted city in the words, "How often would I have gathered thy children together as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!" This "how often" is inexplicable except we take into account the first sojourn of John ii. and iii. and the revisiting at the times of feasts, and the miracles and discourses which occurred at these frequent revisitings.

Again, many things in the Galilean ministry require that He

should have both taught and contended at Jerusalem. Thus He sends the lepers He had cleansed to the priests, "to offer the gifts which Moses commanded *for a testimony unto them.*" A prophet of Galilee unknown in Jerusalem to the priests there, was hardly likely to have sent the cleansed lepers for such a purpose; if, however, He had some time before this taught and healed under the shadow of the Temple, and the priests had rejected Him, such a thing was very probable.

Again, His frequent denunciations of the Scribes and Pharisees, in the matter of their false interpretations of the Law, and their hypocrisies, is more in accordance with the fact that He had witnessed these evil things in Jerusalem, which was their centre, rather than among the simpler and sincerer folk of Galilee. So that, as I said, if we would realize the consistency of the Synoptic narratives with themselves, we must assume an earlier Jerusalem ministry.

4. Again, St. John notices how the fame of the miracle of the raising of Lazarus accounts for the multitudes which met the Lord on His entry into Jerusalem; the Synoptics mention the vast multitudes, but give no reason for such a concourse.

5. Again, St. John accounts for the extraordinary wickedness of Judas, in that he had hardened himself by repeated acts of deadly sin wilfully committed under the eye of the Saviour.

6. And by St. John's narrative only can we account for the conduct of Pilate, who, when the Lord avowed Himself the King of the Jews, instead of inquiring further into the matter, said to the chief priests and people, "I find no fault in this Man," and would have released Him on the spot. From St. John we learn that he did inquire of Jesus the nature of His kingdom, and found it to be a spiritual kingdom, "not of this world," and so in no way likely to threaten the government of Cæsar.

But we have now, in the last place, to consider a far more important matter than any yet noticed, in which the fourth Gospel supplements the three Synoptics.

The Synoptics set forth the Son of Man, Christ Jesus, doing the works of God and claiming His attributes, but they do not assert distinctly His eternal existence, and His relation to the Father as His *only begotten* Son; they imply that He is the Son of God in the highest sense, but they do not assert it. A fourth Gospel was required to make all so clear that there can be no misunderstanding in the Christian mind respecting the relation of Jesus to the Father

as His very and only Son. Take St. Matthew's Gospel. He Who is revealed in it is said to be "Emmanuel," "God with us." But in what sense? God had been *with* the children of Israel as their tutelary Deity. He was in their Temple, He walked among them, their chief city was the city of God, the city of the Great King. Does the name of Emmanuel, given to Jesus, imply that the Jehovah of the Jews would henceforth, after the birth of Christ, be still more effectually with them? The fourth Gospel supplies the answer: The Word, Who was with God, and was God, and was in the beginning with God, was now, "made flesh, and dwelt amongst us, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the Only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." So that God is henceforth with men, not potentially only, but personally, in the Person of His Son. Again, the Father is said at Christ's Baptism to have witnessed from heaven, "This is my beloved Son." In what sense? In the sense of being His only-begotten Son.

Again, in St. Matthew the Son, rather than the Father, is represented as being the Supreme Judge. Thus in Matthew vii. 23, and xxv. 31-46, He sets Himself forth as presiding on the judgment-seat at the last day, saying to those whom He rejects, "Depart from Me; I never knew you, all ye that work iniquity," and to those whom He accepts, "Come, ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." To be the final Judge of all intelligences, is the especial prerogative of God. What is the explanation of this? St. John tells us that Jesus said, "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son." (v. 22.)

Again, the Christ of St. Matthew sets Himself forth as the object of supreme love (x. 37), as greater than the Temple (xii. 6), greater than the Sabbath (xii. 8), the object of the faith of the Gentiles (xii. 21), the Lord of Angels (xiii. 37, 41, 42). Why this? Because He said, as St. John tells us, "All men are to honour the Son even as they honour the Father." "All things that the Father hath are mine."

Again, He asks the Pharisees, "If David call Messiah Lord, how is He his Son?" St. John distinctly teaches us His pre-existence, and tells us that He said, "Before Abraham was, I am."

The last illustration I shall give is from the parable called "The Wicked Husbandmen." (Matthew xxi. 33.) God is there represented as sending His servants to receive of the fruits of the vine-

yard, and when the husbandmen had beaten one servant, and killed another, and rejected all; last of all, it is said, He sent His Son, saying, "They will reverence my Son." The Son here is distinguished from the servants, though amongst those servants were Moses, Samuel, David, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, and the Baptist. In what sense is the Son sent last to be distinguished from these former children of God? St. John's Gospel tells us throughout: they were all created sons, and no servants only, He was the only begotten, God was His own, His proper Father, and so He was "equal with God."

For explanation of terms in critical notes, I must refer the reader to my commentary on St. Matthew, Introduction, pp. 21-40, and for the history of the controversy respecting the authenticity of this Gospel, to Godet's Introduction, Book III., and to Luthardt's "St. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel," chap. ii. Luthardt in his volume gives a list of 500 works bearing on this subject, ranging from 1792 to 1875.

INTRODUCTION TO THE EXORDIUM.

(John i. 1-14.)

ON THE TERM LOGOS, OR WORD, AND ITS APPLICATION TO THE SON OF GOD.

It is useless to inquire as to the origin of this idea in the mind of St. John. The term Meymera, translated "Word," is in many places applied to manifestations of the Divine Being in the ancient Chaldee paraphrases of the Old Testament, as if the unseen God was seen and conversed with through the medium of another Personal Being, emanating from, but closely connected with, Himself. Thus, according to the Hebrew text of Genesis iii. 8, Adam and Eve are said to have "heard the voice of the Lord God, walking in the garden in the cool of the day." In the Chaldee paraphrase of Onkelos, they are said to have "heard the voice of the Meymera (or Word) of the Lord God, walking in the garden." As these paraphrases were probably written about the time of Christ (some think before), St. John could scarcely fail to be acquainted with such interpretations.

Then, in the writings of Greek philosophers, known, perhaps, to himself, and certainly to those with whom he was in constant intercourse, the term Word was used to express a sort of mediating principle between the Divine Being and the universe. These two streams of speculative thought—viz., that from the Jewish paraphrases and that from the Gentile philosophy—seem to meet in the writings of the Alexandrian Jew, Philo. His works are full of references to the Logos; but it is well-night impossible to ascertain what his real opinions were. Sometimes he speaks of the Logos as an idea; sometimes as a person, even calling him "Archangel."

But we have really little to do with the origin of the term; for if we believe St. John to have been one of those who had the special guidance of the Spirit to lead him into all truth respecting these high things of God, then the term Logos is applied to the Son of God by God Himself; and it becomes us most reverently and humbly to inquire why it is so applied to Him. The reason may be stated thus.

In the exordium, two names or titles, each denoting His emanation from the Supreme God, are given to the Lord—the name "Only-begotten Son," and the name "Word" or "Logos."

The word Son implies the (so to speak) natural relation of the Second Person to the First. He is to the Father all that is implied in the word "Son," and the Father is to Him all that is implied in the word "Father." Consequently, He is set forth as deriving Life from the Father (John v. 26, vi. 57); as doing all that the Father does (v. 19); as equal to the Father in nature, being His Very Son (v. 18); as loving, obeying, and manifesting the Father, and as being loved by the Father, and sharing glory with Him before the world was (xvii. 5, 24.)

But if we had only the word Son, to express the relationship between the First and Second Persons, there would be danger of our regarding this relationship from a merely human point of view, and judging of it by the earthly and temporal fatherhood and sonship, so as, for instance, to conceive of the Son as being begotten in time, as human sons are.

To render all such misconceptions impossible, the Spirit of God in this exordium teaches us that the Son is also the Word of the Father. Now, what is "Word" or "Logos"? It is not a part of speech, as we use the term. It has a far more extensive meaning. It is thought, embodied or expressed in language. It is that which is in our minds or spirits set forth in that medium of articu-

late sounds which God has given to us, in order that we may make our very selves known to our fellows. The most true and fitting words give us the most exact conception of the heart and soul of him whose words they are; and so the Son is called the Word, as being the setting-forth, or manifestation, of the hidden intellect, power, love and righteousness of God: so that His creatures may be able to apprehend Him Whom no man hath seen, or can see.

So that the Eternal Word is the perfect utterance, or showing forth, or manifestation of the unseen God.

By the use of this term, the Evangelist expresses, in a more spiritual and intellectual way, the idea "Image of the invisible God," of Colossians i.; or "Brightness of His glory" and "express Image of His Person," of Hebrews i. The term Word, then, as applied to the Son, is the highest which we know of for expressing the Divine relations between the First and Second Persons of the Godhead. It is the highest, because it is the least anthropomorphic. The employment of it most strongly impresses upon us the ineffably spiritual character of the eternal Generation. It also naturally carries us further back than the term "Son," for men have conceived of God as being without a Son; but we cannot imagine mind or intellect without power of forming a conception, and making that conception known out of itself. We cannot imagine this in such a Being as God is. The use of this expression thus teaches us that the existence of the Son as the Word or manifestation of the Father is as necessarily inherent in the Godhead as intellect and utterances are in us reasonable creatures.

But though the term Logos affords us this, it does not give us that view of the distinct Personality of the Eternal Son which is implied in His being a Son, and of the Divine Love between Him and His Father which is proper to Him as a Son. And so as the New Testament is written more especially to reveal to us that "God is love," we have everywhere throughout the Book the term Son applied to Christ; and the term Word—the more intellectual term—used five or, at the most, six times.

In accordance with this, the Church has naturally, one may say, adopted the term Son, as better showing forth that ineffable love between the First and Second Persons, which so enhances the love of the Father, in giving His Son for her, and the love of the Son in obeying His Father's will, and submitting to death on her account.

In her creeds, she has used the name of Son, and that only.

A COMMENTARY.

ST. JOHN.

CHAP. I.

IN the beginning [a] was the Word, and the Word

[a] Prov. viii. 22, 23, &c. Col. i. 17. 1 John. i. 1. Rev. i. 2. & xix. 13.

1. "In [the] beginning." No article before "beginning," as there is none before the corresponding Hebrew word, רֵאשִׁית, in Gen. i. 1, or Prov. viii. 22, or in the Sept. rendering of either of these places. The addition of the article gives it more of the idea of a definite point of time, whereas without the article indefinite or limitless duration is rather denoted.

1. "In the beginning was the Word." "In the beginning," that is, before all time, in the fathomless depths of the past eternity: as the Church in her creed expresses it, "Begotten of His Father before all worlds." Before all the ages or æons, for that is the true rendering of these words of the Creed.

Neither in the Hebrew of Genesis i. nor in the Greek of this place is there any article before the word "beginning." It does not mean in *the* beginning, as indicating a particular beginning, a moment which can be defined: no, let us put back the origin of created things as far as we please, still the Word existed. It is not, then, to be understood as if on the first of the six days, when duration first began to be measured, the Word was. Rather let us hold that between God's first creative act and the work of the first day in dividing the light from the darkness, there were countless ages when "The earth was without form and void, and darkness upon the face of the deep," during which and before which the Word *was*.

was [b] with God, [c] and the Word was God.

[b] Prov. viii. 30 ch. xvii. 5. 1 John i. 2.
[c] Phil. ii. 6. 1 John v. 7.

There is also a marked contrast between the wording of the book of Genesis and that of St. John's Gospel, which leads us up to the idea of the eternity of the Word. In "the beginning," as it is in the book of Genesis, God created. In "the beginning," as it is in St. John, the Word was. In "the beginning" in the one sacred writer God performed an act. In "the beginning" in the other an Intelligence was in existence; and that the Evangelist means to put the existence of this Intelligence as anterior to everything that can be called "beginning"—in fact, from everlasting, is certain from the things which here and elsewhere are said of Him Who was thus "in the beginning." For the relations of the Son to the Father are elsewhere described in terms which render it unimaginable that God should ever have been without Him. We might as well try to conceive of God without His highest attributes. St. John in writing this exordium had evidently as much in his mind the personification of the Divine Wisdom in the book of Proverbs as he had the account of creation, and in the eighth of Proverbs Wisdom is described as saying, "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of His way before His works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. . . . . Then was I by Him, as one brought up with Him: and I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him."

Is it to be imagined that there ever was a time when God began to possess this Wisdom—that there ever was a time when Wisdom first *began* to be with Him, and that there ever was a time when God began daily to delight in this Wisdom? If the Son because He is the outcoming Word of God be the expression of His hidden Wisdom, can it be thought that the Divine Being has ever been without Him? As well might we suppose a perfect human being without intelligence or power of utterance. Now the Holy Spirit, in speaking of the Son of God as the "Word of God," as "with God," "in the bosom of God," as "God in Him and He in God," as "the brightness of His glory," as the "power" of God, and the "Wisdom of God," necessarily implies that He Who is all this, and of Whom all this can properly be said, is essential to the Divine perfection, so that to say these things of Him is to assert His co-eternity with the Father.

2 [d] The same was in the beginning with God. [d] Gen. i. 1.

---

2. "The same." Literally, "this [Logos or Word] was," &c.

The Word was "with God." The preposition translated "with" has a remarkable meaning. It has not merely the same significancy as our preposition "with." It implies that the Word is, in a sense, out of, or apart from, God, and yet looking towards Him; "expressing as in 1 John i. 2, the existence of the Logos in God in respect of Intercourse." (Meyer.) Again, "the Greek word *pros* [προς] expresses proximity, but combining with it the idea of drawing near: it indicates an active relation—a felt and personal communion. The real translation would be 'The Word was in relation with God,' but it is best to preserve the old form, 'The word was with God.'" (Godet.) The simplest illustration of St. John's phrase is got from Genesis i. 26, where (with the utmost reverence be it said) the Two Persons of the Godhead look to One another, and the One says to the Other, "Let US make man in *our* image, after our likeness." It is to this intimate counsel in the depths of the Divine Being that this second proposition of the Apostle alludes, as the first referred to Gen. i. 1. May I supplement this with a reference to Prov. viii., "Then was I BY Him, as one brought up WITH Him, and I was daily His delight"? So that this "with" does not mean "in," just as wisdom, or love, or power may be "in" God, yet in no respect having distinct personality, but it carries with it distinctness of person from the Father, and yet communion with Him, such communion ineffable in its reality, and yet capable of being put into human language in such words as "I have learned of My Father," "I have known the Father," "I know the Father," "I love the Father."

Just, then, as the first clause, "In the beginning was the Word," teaches His eternal existence, so this second, "The Word was with God," teaches His separate personality: in speaking to God He marks His own individuality by using the personal pronoun, "I," "I have glorified Thee," "I have known thee," "Thou lovedst me," "Glorify thou Me;" and yet such close and ineffable union that He says, "I and the Father are one."

"The Word was God." In the former, *i.e.*, the second clause, the word "God" is used with the article. The Word was with *the* God—with Him Who, being unbegotten is originally and

e Ps. xxxiii. 6. ver. 10. 1 ph. iii. 9. Col. i. 16. Heb. i. 2. Rev. iv. 11.

3 e All things were made by him; and without

3. "Were made," *i.e.*, "came into being."
"By him;" rather, "through" Him. All things are "of the Father, through [the instrumentality of] the Son.

essentially God of Himself, "made of none, neither created nor begotten."

But in the third clause the term God is without the article, and so must be understood as if it meant "partaking fully of the nature of God." The two clauses can only be expressed to English-speaking people by a sort of paraphrase. The Word was with the one God and Father of all, and the Word, because He is the true and proper Son of the one God, was God, fully partaking of the nature of His Father, and so of the same order of being as He is.[1] In the second clause the Father, because He is the Person by Whom the Son is begotten, and of Whose substance the Son is, is called God absolutely, "*the* God," as gathering up into Himself the whole Divine Nature. In the third clause the Son, because He is begotten in all the fulness and perfection of that nature, is called "God." God was "the Word." The Nicene Creed reproduces this doctrine: "I believe in one God the Father . . . I believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of His Father before all worlds, God of [or out of] God."

The truth revealed in these four words, "The Word was God," is the highest thing which can be revealed to us respecting God. It is the most absolute dogma in the sense of authoritative utterance conceivable. The Church, in all her creeds, articles, standards, decrees of councils, has added nothing to it. In fact, nothing can go beyond it in the direction of the glory of the

[1] "The word Θεός, God, used as an attribute, simply expresses the notion of kind. It is an adjective which, while maintaining the personal distinction between God and the Logos, ascribes to the latter all the attributes of the Divine Essence, in opposition to every other essence which could have been assigned to Him either angelic or human." (Godet.) My friend the Rev. W. A. O'Conor of St. Jude's, Manchester, translates, "The Word was with the Deity, and the Word was Deity."

him was not any thing made that was made.

---

eternal Son. The dogmatic statements of the Church have rather modified it, but in such a good and right way that we can intelligently hold that "the Word was God," and yet believe perfectly the unity of the Divine Nature, in that we confess that the Son is not God unoriginate, of Himself, but "of the Father alone," God from God, "not made, nor created, but begotten."

The truths set forth in this verse—the being of the Word, the Eternity of the Word, the co-existence of the Word with God, and the participation by the Word in the one Divine Nature—are in another way the most blessed Revelation respecting God which man can receive, for it assures us that in the Divine Nature there is not one mere "self"—absolutely lonely, absolutely solitary, absolutely without communion or fellowship worthy of Himself; but that in the One Godhead there has ever been a relationship answering to one of the closest relationships amongst men: for there has ever been in the Godhead a Father and a Son, the Son loving the Father and the Father the Son. On this ground only can we understand or believe that "God is love"—that is, is eternally and essentially Love. If God only began to love when late in eternity He created beings upon whom He could set His Love, then He is not essentially Love, because He was an eternity without loving, having no one to love; but it is only sufficient to name such a thing to show that it could not be.

2. The Same (or this Word, Who was in the beginning, Who was with God, and Who was God), "was in the beginning with God." Is this a mere repetition of clause 2 of the first verse? I think not: it seems written to reassure us of the distinct personality of the Word. The clause, "The Word was with God," expresses distinct personality: for if one intelligence is said to be "with" another, the one must be personally distinct from the other. But since God is One, and the last clause had been "the Word was God," the reader might think that such an affirmation was a virtual denial of His proper Personality; so, to obviate this, the clause which asserts that Personality is reiterated, "the Same was in the beginning with God." If the Evangelist had been describing the Second Person as the Son of God, this reiterated statement would not have been needed, for all idea of sonship necessarily carries with it personal existence, distinct from a father. But not so with the term

f ch. v. 26. 1 John v. 11.
g ch. viii. 12. & ix. 5. & xii. 35, 46.

4 f In him was life; and g the life was the light of men.

4. Many Fathers and modern expositors, as is noticed below, include the last two words of the third and the first clause of this verse in one sentence, "That which was made was life in Him." There are reasons against it which seem insuperable. Tischendorf reads as in Received Text; Westcott and Hort adopt the reading. Both these editors have notes of very great length upon the passage. The testimony of some of the oldest MSS. is unavailable, being without pointing.

"Word." It does not carry with it the idea of distinct individuality; particularly where the Word is said to be God; and so, in order that there may be no mistake about a matter of such supreme importance, the particular truth which is most likely to be lost sight of is repeated in the words, "The same was in the beginning with God."

3. "All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made." The Greek word for "all things" being without the article, expresses not so much that He created "the whole," "the all," the Universe, as that He made all the things in that Universe. All things visible and invisible, one by one, as we say. "Every creature in the Universe was made by Him; the greater and the lesser; by Him were made things above, beneath; corporeal, incorporeal; by Him were they made. No form, no structure, no harmony of parts, no substance whatsoever that is capable of being weighed, or numbered, or measured, exists but by and from that Creator Word to Whom it is said, 'Thou hast ordered all things in number and measure and weight.'" It has been supposed by St. Augustine that St. John reiterates this truth in the latter clause of this verse, to meet certain very ancient errors of Gnostics, who blasphemously taught that the Word was one of many Œons, and that some of these were brought into existence before Him.

Notice how differently the Evangelist speaks of His existence, and that of the creatures. He *was*, whereas all others were *made* or came into existence. He was before all time, whereas all things came into existence in time.

4. "In Him was life; and the life was the light of men." We have to notice here a remarkable difference in the translation and consequent signification of these words. As the words, "In Him was life," stand in our version, they express the great truth which

5 And [h] the light shineth in darkness; and the [h] ch. iii 19.

5. "Darkness." Properly, "*the* darkness."

He Himself set forth more than once in this Gospel, where He says, "I am the way, the truth, and the LIFE;" and "As the Father hath Life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have Life in Himself."

But this is not the meaning which almost all the Fathers before the time of Chrysostom, and a number of modern expositors give to the words. They take the last words of the third with the first clause of the fourth verse, "That which was made was Life in Him." So rendered, it means that creation has not life in itself, but it had, and yet has, life from the Word.

But notwithstanding the authority for taking the passage in this sense, there is a very strong objection indeed against it, namely, this, that it seems impossible to say of any creature whatsoever that it *is* life in the Word. It *has* life by being in Him, and He in it; but of no created being is it possible to say that it *is* life.

And besides this, the words "that which is made" of our verse 3 seem to include every created thing, and it cannot be said that *all* created things are life, even in the Word.

Some have got over this difficulty by the extraordinary philosophical assumption that the ideas of things being in Him (in His mind), before they are created in the outward Universe, are living: so that in Him are ideas of things which, whilst they are in Him are "living," but as soon as He has given to them outward shape and place, they are dead. The idea of the planet, or of the rock, or of the sea is alive whilst it is only idea in His mind, but dead when He outwardly creates it. But surely the Apostle cannot possibly mean this.[1] From these and other considerations it seems preferable, if we can possibly do so, to render the passage as in the Authorized, "In Him was Life."

[1] Meyer and Godet notice that there seems a grammatical difficulty in taking it thus. The two last words of verse 3 have a present meaning—that which is in existence—and this is incompatible with the "was" of "In Him was life," that which *is* now in being *was* Life in Him.

darkness comprehended it not.

"Comprehended it not." Some understand this as "overcame it not." See below.

The Life here must be taken in the most distinct sense. All life, from that of the lichen creeping on the dead rock to that of the Seraphim—all life was in Him, and derived from Him to the various creatures which He brought into being; but not to all in the same degree, but according to the capacities which He gave to each. That life which, in the lower order of creatures, shows itself in unconscious instincts for choosing some lower good, in man becomes the infinitely higher instinct for discerning and choosing what is morally and intellectually good—in fact, which enables him to apprehend God, and choose the highest good; and so, what was only "life" in lower forms became in him "light," moral and spiritual light. But how is it said that this life *was* the light, rather that *is* the light? Most probably this was said of man's original state of innocence.[1] Life being now corrupted at its source is not the perfect light it once was.

5. "And the light shineth in darkness." Here we have a clear intimation of the fall, and of its real nature as a darkening of the soul. As the light must be moral light, the light which shows God and His character, and leads to Him, so its opposite must be the darkness of moral evil, hiding God from the soul, and leading it away from Him.

By the "light shining in darkness" St. John seems to set forth that, notwithstanding the fall, the light of God's truth yet continued by God's grace to shine in the world; opposed, dimmed, obscured by the darkness, and yet never extinguished, always shining, always bearing witness to God.

"And the darkness comprehended it not." We must remember that the light and darkness are both personal. The light is not a

[1] "Nothing is as yet said of the working of the Logos after His Incarnation (xiv. 6), but (observe the "was," ἦν) that the Divine Truth in that primæval time came to man from the Logos as the source of life: life in Him was for mankind the actually communicating principle of the Divine Truth (Aletheia), in the possession of which they lived in that fair morning of Creation before, through sin, darkness had broken in upon them." (Meyer.)

6 ¶ [i] There was a man sent from God, whose name *was* John.

[i] Mal. iii. 1. Matt. iii. 1. Luke iii. 2. ver. 33.

6. "There was." Literally, "There came [into existence]"—the same word as in verse 2. It should be translated, "there came" or "there appeared."

mere abstract moral principle, though we call it moral light, but it is the Word enlightening human beings with God's truth; similarly the darkness is the same human race blinded by the power of darkness." "The god of this world, who blindeth the eyes." (2 Cor. iv. 4.)

What is meant, then, by "the darkness comprehending it not"? Chrysostom and several modern commentators after him understand it as meaning "the darkness overcame it not," so as to prevent its shining—the light, notwithstanding the opposition, still shineth. Others give an exactly contrary sense, understanding "comprehended it not" as meaning "received it not" so as to be turned from darkness to light by the reception.

Let the reader remember what we said about the light and the darkness being, in a manner, personal. In this case the thought is parallel to that in the words "men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil." In this mixed state of things there has ever been, and ever will be, a warfare between light and darkness. The coming of the Saviour did not extinguish this warfare. It rather intensified it, as He says: "For judgment I am come into the world, that they which see not might see, and that they which see might be made blind" (ix. 39). St. John seems to assign the present victory to the Light when he says, "The darkness is past, and the true light now shineth," but other words of his in the same Epistle teach us that in the very Christian Church itself the darkness may maintain its hold: "He that hateth his brother is in darkness, and walketh in darkness" (1 John ii. 11).

"The darkness comprehended it not." St. Augustine remarks on this, "Just as if you place a blind person in the sunshine, although the sun is present to him, yet he is absent from the sun; in the same way every foolish man, every unrighteous man, every ungodly man is blind in heart. Wisdom is present to him, but present with one blind, not present to his eyes; not because it is not present to him, but he is not present to it. What course, then, ought such an one to take? Let him cleanse the eyes of his heart that he may be able to see God."

6. "There was a man sent from God, whose name was John."

7 [k] The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the
[k] Acts xix. 4. Light, that all *men* through him might believe.

It is necessary to inquire why the Evangelist should here bring forward the testimony of the Baptist. Hitherto what he had been saying of the Word was, so to speak, superhistorical. Now he prepares to set forth the manifestation of the Word in history; and so he connects it with the mission of the forerunner. This may seem strange, seeing that when the Evangelist wrote men had long ceased to come to Christ through the testimony of the Baptist; but we are to remember that one dispensation ended and another began with the Baptist. "The law and the prophets were until John, since that time the kingdom of God is preached." The "Word made flesh" was not manifested for purposes of salvation till He was preached, and the Baptist first preached that He was manifested. The mission of John was the dawn of the new Day.

We are also to remember that the Evangelist would have a personal interest in the mission of the Baptist: for it was the Baptist who had directed him to Christ. He had heard the Baptist say, "Behold the Lamb of God," and from that time he had followed Jesus.[1]

7. "The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the light." The Word, when He became incarnate, needed that He should be borne

---

[1] Godet has a valuable remark: "Our Evangelist uses simply the name of John without adding the epithet 'Baptist,' which had become inseparable from the name, as appears from the Synoptics and even from the Jewish historian, Josephus. Is not Meyer right in concluding from this omission that the author of our Gospel must have known the forerunner otherwise than by tradition? But for that he would certainly have designated him by using the full title received in the Church. If, on the contrary, he knew him before the public voice applied to him the surname, it is quite natural that he should describe him briefly as he does here. Besides, Credner has remarked that as the title Baptist served in the Church to distinguish the forerunner from another John not less celebrated, the Evangelist, if he was that other John, must avoid employing the title (Baptist), lest he should indirectly draw attention to his own person."

8 He was not that Light, but *was sent* to bear witness of that Light.

---

witness to because He came in humiliation—in the flesh, and because His work was to be spiritual, having its power in the unseen and spiritual world rather than in that which is seen. And so there was one sent to bear witness to Him—to what He was and to what He was about to do. The Baptist witnessed that the dignity of His Nature was such that noone man whatsoever, no matter how favoured by God, and great amongst men, was worthy to render to Him the most menial service—that He was the Lamb of God, and so could atone for all sin—and that He alone baptized with the Holy Ghost.

He was sent thus to witness in order that "all men through him might believe." It was the desire of God that all men should be saved through belief in His Son, but the will of man must concur with and give its assent to, the will of God. God cannot treat men as if they were stocks and stones, to be moved about without any will of their own. God must respect that freedom of will, that power of choice, which He has made the characteristic of all intelligent creatures; and so it was that all men did not believe: they did not because they would not.

8. "He was not that light, but was sent to bear witness," &c. It seems strange that the Evangelist, after speaking of the Word as "with God," and as "God," and as the Light of men, should think it needful to say that the forerunner was "not that light;" but it may help to account for this if we remember what an effect his preaching produced. It seems to have occasioned a more widespread impression at the time than the preaching of Christ Himself. Christ witnesses of him that he was "more than a prophet"—a "burning and a shining light," and that the Jews were "willing for a season to rejoice in his light." It appears, too, from Acts xviii. 25 and xix. 3, that no inconsiderable number of the Jews dispersed among the Gentiles had believed on him, and yet had not passed on to accept perfectly Him to Whom he bare witness. Apollos was one of these.

All these considerations make it less strange that the Apostle should write "He was not that light, but was sent to bear witness of that light."

9. "That was the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." The meaning of this verse is considerably affected by its punctuation. It may be taken as meaning, "that

9 [1] *That* was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.

[1] ver. 4. Is. xlix. 6. [1] John ii. 8.

9. Many expound this verse as if "cometh into the world" agrees with the true Light, "That was the true Light which, coming into the world, lighteth every man."

He was the true Light, which lighteth every man coming into the world," so, Chrysostom, Augustine, and many ancient commentators; or it may be taken, "He was the true light which, coming into the world, lighteth every man." The preponderance of modern authorities is much in favour of the second rendering, which is further supported by the fact that the phrase, "coming into the world" is frequently used in this Gospel, and invariably with reference to the coming of the Son of God.

But what is meant by the passage, taking it as "The light which coming into the world lighteth every man"? It seems to refer to some universal illumination of all men, and this previous to His manifestation in the Incarnation. The oldest reference to this verse is in Justin Martyr, and I believe that it gives the true meaning. "We have been taught," he writes (Apol. 1, ch. xlvi.), "that Christ is the firstborn of God, and we have declared above that He is the Word of Whom every race of men were partakers, and those who lived reasonably (or with the Logos, *οἱ μετὰ λόγου βιώσαντες*) are Christians, even though they have been thought Atheists, as among the Greeks, Socrates and Heraclitus, and men like them." Again, "No one trusted in Socrates, so as to die for his doctrine, but in Christ, Who was partially known even by Socrates, for He was, and is, the Word Who is in every man," &c. (Apol. 2, ch. x.)

This place, then, is an expansion of the former declaration, "the life was the light of men." It is also an expansion of the words of Wisdom in the Book of Proverbs, "My delights were with the sons of men." "The elements and types and seminal principles and constructive powers of the moral world, in ruins though it be, are to be referred to Him. He enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world. His are the dictates of the moral sense, and the retributive reproaches of conscience. The old saws of nations, the majestic precepts of philosophy, the luminous maxims of law, the oracles of individual wisdom, the traditionary rules of truth, justice, and religion, even though imbedded in the corruption, or alloyed

10 He was in the world, and [m] the world was made by him, and the world knew him not.

[m] ver. 3. Heb. i. 2. & xi. 3.

10. "*By* Him;" rather, "*through* Him," as in verse 3.

with the pride of the world, bespeak His original agency, and His long-suffering presence. Even where there is habitual rebellion against Him, or profound, far-spreading social depravity, still the under-current, or the heroic outburst of natural virtue, as well as the yearnings of the heart after what it has not, and its presentiment of its true remedies, are to be ascribed to the Author of all good." (Newman, on "University Education," p. 95.)

The "true" light here is not opposed to false light, but to derived or created light. The true light is the Divine Essential Light. Owing to the evil and ignorance in man, it may shine dimly and imperfectly; but nevertheless it shines from above, and is not the product of any natural forces or laws gradually developing themselves, but is a gleam from God Himself, by which He would lead men up to Himself, and by which He will judge them.

10. "He was in the world," *i.e.*, before He became incarnate, when, coming in the light of the law written in the heart and conscience, He enlightened in some degree every man.

"The world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not." If this refers to the manifestations of the Word before the Incarnation, it means that mankind universally did not recognize the Voice within them, witnessing to goodness and virtue and holiness, as the witness to the true God, the one supreme Good. (See Rom. i. 19-26.)

But in these verses the Evangelist passes almost imperceptibly from the pre-historical or super-historical revelation of the Word which lighteth every man, Heathen or Jew, to the historical Manifestation, through the appearance amongst men of the Word Incarnate. "He was in the world, and the world was made by Him" seems to refer principally to the Word as the Implanter and Sustainer of the moral sense. In this He was *in* the world from the first, rather than "coming into it" at some period of time; but in St. John's time, *i.e.*, in the fulness of time, when all was ready, when the Spirit of Prophecy had diffused an almost universal expectancy, and when the wickedness of men had reached such a pass that good men thought that if there was a Divine Providence there

11 [n] He came unto his own, and his own received him not.

12 But [o] as many as received him, to them gave he || power to become the sons of God, *even* to them that believe on his name:

n Luke xix. 14. Acts iii. 26 & xiii. 46.
o Is. lvi. 5. Rom. viii. 15. Gal. iii. 26. 2 Pet. i. 4. 1 John iii. 1.
|| Or, *the right, or, privilege.*

---

11. "His own—His own," the first neuter, the second masculine. "He came unto His own possession, and His own people received Him not." (Alford.)

12. "Power;" rather, "right" or "privilege," as in margin.

"Sons of God;" rather "children."

must be a destruction of all, or a Redemption, then He CAME. He Who had been all along in the world invisibly, now came visibly.

11. "He came unto his own," *i.e.*, His own peculiar people, the children of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Before coming down to the earth, the Logos had prepared for Himself a dwelling-place, which belonged to Him peculiarly, and which should have been, as it were, His door of entrance into the world. (Godet.)

"His own received him not." The God invoked by the nation appears in His own temple, and is crucified by His own worshippers. Jerusalem refused to be gathered; but a remnant received Him—a holy seed, to be the substance of a better and more spiritual Israel.

12. "As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God"—rather, gave them the right, the privilege. The expression is remarkable. It seems to teach that the power to become a son of God is one thing, and the actual becoming is another. The power to become a son or child comes from receiving Christ, or believing on His Name; but the actual becoming is, in the Christian dispensation, not an isolated privilege, but one belonging to the mystical body. "He that believeth and is baptized." "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one Body."

The word "sons" should rather be translated "children." Sons may be by adoption, whereas the word "children" implies transmission of nature. This is very important to remember, for the peculiar grace of the Christian covenant is partaking of the full human nature, body, soul, and spirit of the Son of God, the Second Adam.

"In his name." They that receive Him are, according to the latter clause of this verse, "they that believe on His name," His name as the only-begotten Son of God: not His work only, or His character, or even His love considered apart by itself, not His reve-

13 [p] Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.

p ch. iii. 5. James i. 18. 1 Pet. i. 23.

---

13. "Born" or "begotten."
"Blood." Literally, "bloods," *ex sanguinibus*. (Vulg.)

lation of the Fatherhood of God, nor His witness to the good and the right; but His Name, as indicating that He is what His Name means, the Only-begotten of the Father; so that God, in giving Him, gave no mere servant, but the Son; sent no prophet, but His Son; spared no mere creature, but spared not His own Son.

Do all, then, who by hereditary custom receive the declarations of the Catholic Creed respecting His Sonship, receive Him? No; to receive Him is to apprehend Him, to plead His Name, to use Him, so to speak, for the purposes for which He is revealed as the Son of God, and sent into the world.

13. "Which were born, not of blood [bloods, *ex sanguinibus*], nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man," &c. The term "bloods" has been variously explained. It has been supposed to refer to the duality of the sexes, or to the plurality of ancestors which each human being possesses. It has even been imagined to refer to the multiplicity of elements in the blood. I cannot, however, help thinking that races are meant. The Jewish race were, as Abraham's seed in a certain sense, children of God. The Regeneration was not to be as this. In Christ there was to be "neither Jew nor Greek, Barbarian, Scythian, bond, nor free." "Nor of the will of the flesh," *i.e.*, owing to low carnal desires. "Nor of the will of man," *i.e.*, of man desiring to beget children for the higher purpose of raising up a seed to God, as Abraham, Manoah, and Zechariah.

"Of God." Through the instrumentality of His word and promise, which word and promises are not only in the written word, or the spoken word, but in the Sacrament of Regeneration, to which God has annexed His promise, as much as to the reading or hearing of His word.

14. "And the Word was made flesh." The same word as that which is translated "was made" in verse 3 ("All things were made by Him"). And there is, no doubt, a certain parallelism suggested by the recurrence of the word. As all things came into existence by Him, so He Himself came into a new state of existence. From the time of

q Matt. i. 16, 20. Luke i. 31, 35. & ii. 7. 1 Tim. iii. 16.
r Rom. i. 3. Gal. iv. 4.
s Heb. ii. 11, 14, 16, 17.

14 q And the Word r was made s flesh, and

14. "Was made." Properly, "became," as in verse 3.

His Incarnation He Who before was God only, became a creature, became man, so that as truly and perfectly as He is God, so truly and perfectly is He man. The Divine Nature did not cease to be what it was, nor was it in the least degree lowered in its essence or attributes. The mystery took place, "not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the manhood into God:" and as the Divine nature was in no respects lessened or curtailed, so the human was not so raised or sublimated by the Divine dwelling in it as to be raised above the ordinary condition in which it exists in this world. It hungered, and thirsted, and was subject to pain and death.

14. "And the Word was made flesh." By flesh is meant the whole human nature which is here, as in many other places, described by its lowest part, and not by its highest. It is not said of Christ, the Second Adam, as it was of the first, that "He became a living soul," but that He was "made flesh," to mark the depth of His humiliation.

It is to be remembered that as the Godhead did not act in the place of a human soul, so neither did the Divine Nature extinguish or overwhelm by its Presence the human soul; but His soul and spirit remained perfect in their respective actings, for "in all things it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren:" so that we "have not an high priest which could not be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but One Who was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin."

This verse is the full and perfect expression, so far as it can be put into words, of the great Mystery of Godliness.

The mystery is overwhelmingly great, but it is a mystery of Love and Condescension. It is the link between the Creator and the creature—not with the perfect, but with the imperfect and fallen creature, for the Son of Man, though sinless Himself, became the Brother of sinful creatures. There is One in the Universe, once in the womb, once on the Cross, once in the grave, Who is now at the right Hand of God, Who has within Him the mind, the love, the will of God, and yet also the mind, the love, and the will of man.

dwelt among us, (and [t] we beheld his glory, the

[t] Is. xl. 5. Matt. xvii. 2. ch. ii. 11. & xi. 40. 2 Pet. i. 17

"Dwelt." Literally, "tabernacled."

The best setting forth of the Incarnation which I have seen is in these words: "That Eternal Mind which, till then, had thought and acted as God, began to think and act as a man, with all man's faculties, affections, and imperfections, sin excepted. Before He came on earth He had but the perfections of God; but, afterwards, He had also the virtues of a creature, such as faith, meekness, self-denial. Before He came on earth He could not be tempted of evil; but, afterwards, He had a man's heart, a man's tears, and a man's wants and infirmities. His Divine Nature, indeed, pervaded His Manhood, so that every deed and word of His in the flesh savoured of eternity and infinity; but, on the other hand, from the time He was born of the Virgin Mary, He had a natural fear of danger, a natural shrinking from pain, though ever subject to the ruling influence of that Holy and Eternal Essence which was within Him. For instance, we read on one occasion of His praying that the cup might pass from Him. . . . . Thus He possessed at once a double assemblage of attributes, divine and human. Still He was all powerful, though in the form of a servant; still He was all-knowing, though partially ignorant; still incapable of temptation [so that He should fall], though exposed to it." (J. H. Newman.)

But the words of this passage, "The Word was made Flesh," are not merely the expression of a mystery, but an explanation of an extraordinary paradox—which is this, that throughout those Scriptures which we regard as the most perfect revelation of the Will and Mind of the unseen God, there is a twofold and opposite way of speaking of Him Who is the chief subject of the revelation. He is God, and yet God is His God. He is man, and yet "in the beginning with God." He is the first-born of every creature, and yet born late in the world's history. When He was not fifty years old He said "Before Abraham was, I am." He worked as a carpenter, and yet He had made the worlds. He knew not a certain day, in the proceedings of which He is to act the supreme part, and yet "as the Father knows Him, so He knows the Father." He is the Judge of quick and dead, and yet He refused to arbitrate between two brethren with the words, "Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?" He upholds all things, and yet He was held in His mother's arms

glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) [u] full of grace and truth.

[u] Col. i. 19. & ii. 3, 9.

These, and a vast number of other opposites, are ascribed to Him, and the reconciliation of them all is, that "the Word was made flesh." He was the Word, and so was with God and was God: and He was made flesh, so that He was born, and grew up, and hungered and thirsted, and was tempted, and was weary, and suffered, and died.

Lastly, if these words, "the Word was made flesh," be the very truth of God, then nothing plainly revealed in the rest of Scripture can be rejected simply because of its greatness or mysteriousness, or because it is miraculous, or from any other demands which it may make on our faith. A doctrine taught by man, no matter how good and holy, may be rightly rejected by us on the ground that it is no part of the Revelation, but nothing can be rejected simply on the ground of its mystery; for if we have accepted the truth that the Word was made flesh, we have accepted the greatest conceivable mystery.

"And dwelt [tabernacled] amongst us," *i.e.*, as one of ourselves. Men could ask of Him, "Is not this Jesus, whose father and mother we know?" For thirty years he was an inhabitant of a particular city, a member of a particular family, a citizen of a particular country. He had His relations, friends, neighbours, enemies, disciples; He went in and out amongst them. Men could watch Him so as to observe His conduct. In all these things He was "like unto His brethren."

"We beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father." *We beheld* His glory, "that, which was from the beginning, *which we have* heard, which we have *seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon*, and our hands have handled, of the Word of Life (for the Life *was manifested* and *we have seen it*, and bear witness and show unto you that Eternal Life which was with the Father *and was manifested unto us.*") (1 John i.)

What "glory" was this? Was it the glory which shone through His human frame on the Mount of Transfiguration? Not altogether: for that was, so to speak, an outward brightness, a physical, visible glory, such as that of the sun in the heavens. It was not full of grace and truth as was the glory of His divine Life. His real glory was in His holiness, His meekness and gentleness,

15 ¶ [w] John bare witness of him, and cried, saying, This was he of whom I spake, [x] He that cometh after

[w] ver. 32. ch. iii. 32. & v. 33.
[x] Matt. iii. 11. Mark i. 7. Luke iii. 16. ver. xxvii. 30. ch. iii. 31.

15. "This was He of whom I spake." So A., D., L., all later Uncials, all Cursives, &c., "This was he who spake [the words], He that cometh," &c. So ℵ, B., C.

"He that cometh," &c. *Qui post me venturus est, ante me factus est quia prior me erat* (Vulg.); "He that cometh after me taketh place before me: because He was before me." (Alford.)

His knowledge, and in the wisdom of His Divine utterances as well as in the power manifested in His mighty deeds of compassion.

"Glory as of [the] only begotten of [the] Father." The words in the Greek are without the article, and so the translation is said to be "glory as of an only begotten of a father," as of any father; but this is inadmissible. They must be necessarily understood as if with the article, for it was not as being an only son of *any* father, but the Only Begotten of *the* Father that His glory was manifest. The only son of a human father is not necessarily the image of his father, or a reflection of any feeble glory of any sort which such a father may possess; but in the Godhead alone the Son is the express image of the Father.

"Full of grace and truth." Meyer has a very suggestive remark on this. "The truth (aletheia) corresponds formally to the nature of the Logos as '*light*,' the grace (charis) which bestows everlasting life to His nature as '*Life*.'" Grace throughout Scripture signifies both the graciousness which bestows the favour, and the actual favour or gift bestowed. But in the Divine Being these must be inseparable, for God would not regard anyone with favour without bestowing upon him abundant proofs, outward or inward, of His favour."

"And truth." The Word is the truth ["I am . . . the truth"], and so He set forth in its fulness, as no prophet or messenger of God had done before Him, the truth of God.

15. "John bare witness of him, and cried, saying." The preaching of the Baptist was not mere instruction or solemn warning such as we account preaching to be. It was rather the loud crying or shouting of the herald proclaiming the near approach of the great One heralded. In all probability he cried with all his might for an hour together. "The kingdom of heaven is at hand; repent, repent,

me is preferred before me: [y] for he was before me.

16 And of his [z] fulness have all we received,

[y] ch. viii. 58. Col. i. 17.
[z] ch. iii. 34. Ephes. i. 6, 7, 8. Col. i. 19. & ii. 9, 10.

16. "And of his fulness." "And" read by A. and almost all later Uncials, E., F., G., H., K., M., S., U., &c., most Cursives, Vulg., Syriac (Cureton and Peshito). "Because" read by ℵ, B., C., D., L., one Cursive (33), and some old Latin MSS.

the kingdom of heaven is at hand." This may sound strange to us, but a single word of God's truth such as this proclaimed thus continuously by one whom all felt to be in earnest, would tell infinitely more than a thousand well-arranged discourses.

Verse 15 can scarcely be understood by us except by a paraphrase. 'He that cometh after me, being younger than I, and beginning His ministry after me, is made more honourable than I [perhaps put in front of me], because by His Divine pre-existence He was first with reference to me.' Literally, "He was my chief," only such a phrase, as we use it, does not sufficiently mark the difference. Some, however, understand the whole verse as simply referring to priority of time. The oldest Syriac (Cureton) renders "This is He of whom I said that 'He cometh after me and [yet] is before me,' because He is anterior to me." The difficulty about the former rendering is that if the Baptist was the herald of the Messiah he would naturally come before Him, and as naturally be inferior to Him.

16. "Of his fulness have all we received." These are evidently not the words of the Baptist, but of the Evangelist; the Baptist could hardly have said before the day of Pentecost. "Of his fulness have ALL we received."

"Of his fulness have all we received." This is to be inseparably joined with His manifestation in the flesh. The best exposition of it is in the words of St. Paul, in Coloss. ii., "In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily: and ye are complete [rather, filled full] in Him."

"And of his fulness." In examining into the meaning of this verse we are obliged to take notice of the difference of reading. Several of the oldest MSS., ℵ, B., C., D., read "because" of His fulness. In this case we are compelled to take verse 15 as absolutely out of connection with either what goes before or what comes after it, and consider the word "because" as closely following upon the

and grace for grace.

17 For [a] the law was given by Moses, *but* [b] grace

[a] Exod. xx. 1, &c. Deut. iv. 44. & v. 1. & xxxiii. 4.

[b] Rom. iii. 24. & v. 21. & vi. 14.

17. "*By* Moses . . . *by* Jesus Christ"—"*through* Moses . . . *through* Jesus Christ."

words "full of grace and truth" of verse 14, "the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us . . . full of grace and truth . . . Because of His fulness have ALL we received." The fact of our receiving of His "fulness" shows Him to be "full" of grace.

If we read "and" there seems a better connection. Verse 15 does not seem so utterly out of place. The connection or mutual bearing of the three verses may be understood thus. The Incarnation of the Word and the fulness of grace and truth in Him is laid down in verse 14. His superiority to John, in whom the law and the prophets ended, is, in John's own confession, given in verse 15, and in verse 16 the "all we," *i.e.* Apostles and all Christians who believe on Him through our word, is contrasted with the single witness of John. John witnessed to His pre-existence and His greatness in comparison with his own. We can witness to much more. We can witness to Him as the fountain of grace to His whole mystical Body. "He is Himself the fountain and very root of all good . . . not retaining within Himself the riches of His good things, but overflowing with them unto all others, and after the overflowing remaining full, in nothing diminished by supplying others, but streaming ever forth and imparting to others a share of these blessings, He remains in sameness of perfection. . . . If you take a drop from the sea you have lessened the sea itself, though the diminution be imperceptible. But of that fountain we cannot say this; how much soever a man draw it continues undiminished." (Chrysostom.)

"Grace for grace." Literally, grace against, or instead of, or answering to, grace. The first grace seems to signify the inferior, or preparatory, or typical grace of the Old Covenant, which, though it was scarcely grace at all compared to that which God gives under the New, was wonderful grace compared to that given to the heathen Chrysostom brings out well this also:—"What grace, for what? For the Old, the New. There was a faith, there is a faith ["from faith to faith"]. There was an adoption, there is an adoption ["to whom pertaineth the adoption"]. There was a glory, there is a

c ch. viii. 32 & xiv. 6. and c truth came by Jesus Christ.

---

glory [" for if that which was done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious "]. There was a law, and there is a law [" for the law of the Spirit of Life hath made me free "]. There was a covenant, and there is a covenant [" I will make with you a new Covenant, not according to the Covenant which I made with your fathers "]. There was a sanctification, and there is a sanctification ; there was a Baptism, and there is a Baptism ; there was a sacrifice, and there is a Sacrifice ; there was a temple, and there is a temple . . . and so, too, there was a grace, and there is a grace."

17. " For the law was given by Moses, grace and truth came [were] by Jesus Christ." We have here the Law and the Gospel, the Law and Christ contrasted. It will be necessary to see as to the opposition between these two, wherein it lies. For there was undoubtedly that which could be called " grace " under the law, just as there is a law, and that far stricter and more exacting than the Old Law, under Christ.

The law—not only the law of Moses, but any mere law—being simply a command, can give no power. The power to obey any law of God (*i.e.*, of course, any moral or spiritual law) is Life from God. But the Law cannot give life. As St. Paul says—and what he says is the key to all else which he writes on this all-important matter—" If a law had been given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law." (Gal. iii. 21.)

If God desires that we fallen creatures should obey His will, He must give something more than the mere command ; the weakness of the flesh requires more [Rom. viii. 3], and so He gave His Son, that He, Body, Soul, and Spirit should be our Life—our Life as the Second Adam, to counteract and annul the death we received from the first. This Life is the " grace " which came by Jesus Christ, and with it came the " truth "—the whole truth of God, so far as human beings can receive it—the truth of God's Nature as Father, Son, and Spirit, the truth of God's dealings, the truth respecting God's purposes, that goodness and truth shall ultimately reign in and through Christ ; and if there be any truth of God which is capable of raising us up to Him by our apprehension of it, this comes by Jesus Christ.

This grace is not outward. It is not the exhibition of a character.

18 [d] No man hath seen God at any time; [e] the

[d] Exod. xxxiii. 20. Deut. iv. 12. Matt. xi. 27. Luke x. 22. ch. vi. 46. 1 Tim. i. 17. & vi. 16. 1 John iv. 12, 20.

[e] ver. 14. ch. iii. 16, 18. 1 John iv. 9.

18. "At any time." Same meaning as in John vi. 35. *Deum nemo vidit unquam* (Vulg.); Syriac the same. The words cannot mean "never yet."

no matter how meek and gentle, no matter how engaging and attractive. It is the Life of the God-man coming within us. The grace we require is nothing short of this. No *exhibition* of goodness will reach the need of our case. We need the *communication* of a new principle of life.

18. "No one [not no man, but no one] hath seen God at any time." Does this "no one" refer to man only, or to all created beings? Do the angels in heaven see God? Here, of course, the question is of outward vision with the eye, or means of vision of the outward frame, not of the spiritual or mental apprehension; for of this the Lord said, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." The essential God, the Father Himself, Who is the fountain of Deity, no one hath seen or can see. All the appearances of God have been condescensions to the weakness of the creature, who requires something to assure him that the God Who is in and above all things can localize Himself, as it were, and manifest His presence, or face [as it is called], and so make Himself known to them and converse with them. It is needful that God should do this, or intelligences would think Him to be only a thought, an idea, an abstraction, but whether to angels or to men, all revelations of God must be condescensions to the essential limitations of the creature. Surely it is as true of all finite creatures as of man. "Not that any one hath seen the Father, save He that is of God, He hath seen the Father." (John vi. 46.)

Chrysostom recites a number of instances in which men were said to see God, the last of which is that of the Patriarch Jacob, who took his name from this very thing, being called Israel, for Israel is one that sees God, and then proceeds to say: "How then saith John, 'No man hath seen God at any time'? It is to declare that all these are instances of His condescension, not the vision of the Essence itself unveiled. For had they seen the very nature, they would not have beheld it under different forms, since that is simple, without form or parts or bounding lines. It sits not, nor

only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared *him*.

"The only begotten Son." So A., the later Uncials, all the Cursives except 33, and the Old Latin. The very important alteration, "God only begotten" [*God* without article], is read by the MSS. containing what is called the Neutral text, B., ℵ, and L., also C. (a very mixed text), and the Peshito, in this instance against the Cureton Syriac. Very probably it is alluded to by so old a writer as Justin Martyr. See excursus at the end of this Gospel.

stands, nor walks: these things belong all to bodies . . . Since His Son was about to appear in very flesh, He prepared them from old time to behold the substance of God, as far as it was possible for them to see it; but what God really is, not only have not the prophets seen, but not even angels or archangels;" and he concludes with a very remarkable inference from 1 Tim. iii. 16: "Besides, Paul shows that He is invisible, not only to men, but also to the powers above, for after saying He was manifested in the flesh, he adds, 'was seen of angels,' as if the mystery of Godliness in the Incarnation made the Divine Being visible to angelic natures."

"The only begotten Son." The reader is doubtless aware of the extraordinary difference of reading here, "God only begotten, Who is," &c. This is the reading of that small but important group of manuscripts which contain, wholly or partially, the so-called Neutral Text. This reading (I speak with great hesitation and fear as to such a text) seems on the whole to have been rejected by the Church, though from the intense desire which has always existed in the Church to magnify the Person of the Lord Jesus, she would have had the strongest feeling in its favour, as giving her another direct assertion of His Godhead. It is not in the Greek text as finally received in the third or fourth centuries, nor in the Vulgate. It is in the later (Peshito) though not in the earliest Syriac, which is to me the strongest testimony in its favour.

The whole passage seems to require "only begotten *Son*": for having laid down the invisibility of the Divine Essence, and yet declaring that one Person in that Essence became visible, we should think that the Evangelist would name Him, not by the word "God," which denoted invisibility, but rather by that of "Son," which is associated with visibility.[1]

[1] Professor Westcott notices that by the omission of the article before Θεόν, "thought is turned to the Divine Nature rather than

19 ¶ And this is [f] the record of John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, Who art thou?

[f] ch. v. 33.

19. "Sent." So ℵ, L., most later Uncials, &c. "Sent to him," B., C., 33, 249, Old Latin, Vulg., Syriac, &c.

"In the bosom of the Father." This is not to be taken as if it meant reclining on His bosom, but as being in the Father—knowing Him as the Father knows the Son.

"He hath declared Him." Here is the proper, and, if we may so say, the natural office and function of the Word, to declare, *i.e.*, to set forth, to make known Him Whose Word He is. As this exordium begins with the Being, and Eternity, and Power, and Godhead of the Word, so here it sets forth His special function.

And what has He declared respecting Him? One thing, we can answer, that could not have been known without Himself—that God is naturally and essentially a Father. "The truth brought into the world by the Son does not consist of a collection of new metaphysical ideas about God, but rather of the revelation of His Father-character. To make this revelation, it was sufficient for Jesus to reveal Himself as the Son; for to prove Himself Son is to teach the world what it never would have suspected, that God is essentially a Father. And if He is Father in His inmost essence, and in virtue of an eternal relation, how could His relations to His creatures fail to have also a paternal character? Such is the new explanation which the Son has given of the Divine Being, and which He alone as the Son could give. It is the initiation of the earth into the deepest secret of heaven: God is from all eternity *Father*, that is to say, *Love*. Outside of this Divine Revelation, contained in the life and sayings of Jesus, every idea which man forms of God is imperfect or imaginary, an idea, and, up to a certain point an idol, according to St. John's own expression, 'Little children, keep yourselves from idols.'" (Godet.)

19. The exordium or preface is now finished, and the Evangelist begins the historical part of his Gospel.

He commences it, as St. Mark does, with the preaching and baptism of John, because that was the beginning of the manifesta-

to the Divine Person." The Divine Nature cannot be seen, but the Divine Person of the Son, owing to His Incarnation, can.

20 And [g] he confessed, and denied not; but confessed, I am not the Christ.

[g] Luke iii. 15. ch. iii. 28. Acts xiii. 25.

---

tion of Christ to Israel. From the baptism of John the kingdom of God was preached. With John the old state of things passed away "The Law and the Prophets were until John."

"When the Jews sent priests and Levites," &c. The "Jews" here means the nation through their national council, the Sanhedrim. None, surely, would be able to send a deputation of priests except some person or some assembly in which the chief ecclesiastical authority resided.

Commentator upon commentator speaks disparagingly of this mission of the Jews, as prompted by exclusiveness, bigotry, hostile feeling, &c. But, surely, if there was then existing any ecclesiastical authority whatsoever as distinguished from the Roman rule, it was the plain duty of those who exercised it, when such a person as the Baptist appeared and so moved the religious world of the day, to ask him plainly who he was. If they had not done so their indifference would have been as wicked as their rejection of his message.

"Who art thou?" This can only mean, What message or what commission hast thou from God? It cannot have been a mere personal question, because they must have known perfectly that he was the son of one of the heads of the courses of priests. And by his answer, "I am not the Christ," he showed that he understood that the question was put with reference to his claims as one "sent of God."

20. "He confessed, and denied not; but confessed." It may seem strange to us who look at the Christ in the light of the three creeds of the Church that it should be thought not improper to say of the Baptist, "He confessed, and denied not; but confessed, I am not the Christ;" but we are to remember that there was not only at that time an universal expectation of the coming of some great one, but that all men were "musing in their hearts of John, whether he were the Christ or not." There might have been in the breast of one so favoured by God and highly accounted of by man, a temptation of Satan to exalt himself above his measure, which though he instantly, and perhaps with horror, put from him, yet the thought so presented itself to him that the Evangelist took notice of the victory in the words, "He confessed, and denied not: but con-

21 And they asked him, What then? Art thou [h] Elias? And he saith, I am not. Art thou [i] || that prophet? And he answered, No.

[h] Mal. iv. 5. Matt. xvii. 10.
[i] Deut. xviii. 15, 18.
|| Or, *a prophet?*

22 Then said they unto him, Who art thou? that we may give an answer to them that sent us. What sayest thou of thyself?

23 [k] He said, I *am* the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord, as [l] said the prophet Esaias.

[k] Matt. iii. 3. Mark i. 3. Luke iii. 4. ch. iii. 28.
[l] Is. xl. 3.

---

23. "*The* voice;" rather, "*a* voice."

fessed, I am not the Christ," meaning, of course, not "I am not the Word, the Only Begotten, the true Light," but "I am not the Hope of Israel, I am not the Messenger of the Covenant, I am not the coming Man."

21. "And they asked him, What then? Art thou Elias? And he saith, I am not." But did not Christ say of him, "This is Elias which was for to come," and "Elias is come already"? Yes, but it was one thing for Him Who knew all things to witness respecting John, that as he came in the spirit and power of Elias, so he was the person intended by the prophet, and another thing for himself to witness to it. In all humility, looking back at the miracles of Elias, John thought that he was not his antitype, but Christ knew that he was.

"Art thou that prophet?" *That* prophet seems to refer to the one foretold by God, "I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee" (Deut. xviii. 18). It seems that the Jews did not universally understand this prophecy of the Messiah.

22. "Who art thou? that we may give an answer to them that sent us." John appears to have put off from himself all claim to be any great one foretold in prophecy, but he was still conscious that he had been sent to prepare the way for Christ as one close at hand, and so out of the many prophetic intimations he chose one, which beyond all the rest sinks the messenger in his message, "I am not Elias; I am not that prophet like to Moses. I am simply a 'voice.'"

"The voice of one crying in the wilderness." He could not say less of himself consistently with his faithfulness to Him that had sent him, and he said this.

24 And they which were sent were of the Pharisees.

25 And they asked him, and said unto him, Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet?

[m] Matt. iii. 11. 26 John answered them, saying, [m] I baptize
[n] Mal. iii. 1. with water: [n] but there standeth one among you, whom ye know not;

---

24. Some (omitting Gr. article) render, "And they were sent from the Pharisees." But this is impossible, for the Pharisees as a mere sect could have no power to send Priests and Levites.

25. "*That* Christ . . . *that* prophet." Literally, "*The* Christ . . . *the* prophet."

26. "But" omitted by ℵ, B., L., &c.; retained in A., later Uncials, Cursives, Vulg., Peshito.

24. "They which were sent were of the Pharisees." Why is this remark thrown in, as it were, by the way? It has been supposed by some that the deputation is expressly described as being "of the Pharisees," to explain how it was that the persons composing it busied themselves about some outward rite, as baptism, but this seems very far fetched. The rite being administered to those who were already by circumcision a holy nation, must have meant something, especially as administered by so holy a man as John; and they had a right to ask—indeed, they were bound to ask—what was its significance?

The fact that those sent were Pharisees seems mentioned to show that the strictest sect of religionists of the day were employed to make the inquiry. If the chief priests, who were of the sect of the Sadducees, had had the sole power in the selection of those sent, they would have commissioned men of their own way of thinking, *i.e.* virtual unbelievers. If the secular authorities had made the inquiry, the persons sent would probably have been Herodians or Secularists.

25. "Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ?" &c. This question seems to show that they took certain Messianic prophecies (such as Ezekiel xxxvi. 25) quite literally, and expected that the Messiah (or those who were to prepare the way for Him) when He came would baptize with water. It seems to have been the usual custom to purify proselytes by ablution, but that the children of Abraham required a baptism of any sort would need explanation on the part of him who administered it.

27 ° He it is, who coming after me is preferred before me, whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose.

° ver. 15, 30. Acts xix. 4.

27. "He it is, who coming after me is preferred before me." So A., most Uncials and Cursives, Old Latin, also Vulgate and Peshito, &c.; but ℵ, B., C., L. (the MSS. of the Neutral Text), a few Cursives, and Cureton Syriac, read simply, "who cometh after me," omitting "this is he," and "is preferred before me."

26. "John answered them, saying, I baptize with water," &c. What is the connection? They had asked why he baptized. John's answer does not apparently give the reason. He simply affirms, "I baptize with water." Why did he baptize at all? It could only be to prepare men to receive more willingly and humbly the baptism of Him Whose herald he was. It would have been absurd to prepare the way for a system in which sacraments had a very subordinate part by administering a sacrament or quasi-sacrament, which was the most striking feature in the mission of him who prepared the way for the new state of things.

"I baptize with water." In these words the Baptist very distinctly sets forth that his own baptism was typical, not sacramental. It was in water only, and so we read that those who had only received John's baptism had to be baptized with that of Christ (Acts xix. 3-5). Whereas the Lord's baptism, whether by Himself, or by the hands of His ministers, was in water and the Spirit, the water being the outward visible sign of an inward spiritual grace.

"There standeth one among you, whom ye know not . . . worthy to unloose." It is to be remarked that St. John, after setting forth that his baptism was only in water, does not proceed to say respecting that of Jesus that it was in the Holy Ghost, though afterwards (verse 33) he asserts this as having heard it from God Himself: but he proceeds to set forth the infinite greatness of Him Whose way he was sent to prepare. "There standeth one among you whom ye know not . . . Whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose." As the Christ was, so would be His Baptism. He was One Whom no one knew but the Father. His dignity was such that the most honourable of the servants of God would not be worthy to perform to Him the most menial office. His baptism cannot be merely in water. It must be far greater in its grace than that of any servant of God who had gone before Him. He received the Holy Ghost in all His fulness, that He might baptize men in Him.

28 These things were done [p] in Bethabara beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing.

29 ¶ The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold [q] the Lamb of God, [r] which || taketh away the sin of the world.

p Judg. vii. 24. ch. x. 40.
q Ex. xii. 3. Is. liii. 7. ver. 36. Acts viii. 32. 1 Pet. i. 19. Rev. v. 6, &c.
r Is. liii. 11. 1 Cor. xv. 3. Gal. i. 4. Heb. i. 3. & ii. 17. & ix. 28. 1 Pet. ii. 24. & iii. 18. 1 John ii. 2. & iii. 5. & iv. 10. Rev. i. 5.
|| Or, *beareth.*

28. "Bethabara." A very general consent of MSS., versions, and Fathers, reads "Bethany."

It is clear also that His baptism must be external as well as internal. It must be an outward sign as well as an inward grace. A mere outward baptism, such as that of John, could not prepare men to receive an internal operation of the Spirit accompanied with no outward sign.

28. "These things were done in Bethabara beyond Jordan." The reader is doubtless aware that almost all ancient authorities are in favour of reading "Bethany beyond Jordan." And yet there seems to have been no such place. No place of the name is mentioned either in the Old Testament or in the New, nor could Origen, who was on the spot, and made inquiries about it, find that any place near the Jordan was called by that name. It seems well nigh impossible that all memory of a place so honoured should have so utterly perished in 200 years' time. It is quite possible, however, that the name may refer to a district rather than a place, *i.e.*, to the ancient Bashan, in Roman times called Batanea, the name of Bethany actually lingering yet in Ard-el-Bathanyah, about fifty miles to the east of the Lake of Tiberias, and about the same distance from Nazareth as the place usually considered as the locality where John was baptizing.

29. "The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith," &c. This second coming of Jesus to John, after His Baptism, took place, in all probability, immediately after His temptation. By the Temptation, the Lord was shown to be perfectly sinless, and so was fitted to be that which John pointed Him out as being, "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."

29. "Behold the Lamb of God, which," &c. It has been asked, In what sense must the Jews have understood these words? But we

30 [s]This is he of whom I said, After me cometh a man which is preferred before me: for he was before me. [s] ver. 27.

---

have not to consider in what way the Jews in their then state of ignorance and unbelief would take them, but in what sense did the Holy Spirit mean them and us to understand them. For many things were said, even to the disciples, which they could not understand at the time, but which nevertheless sank into their hearts, and sprang up, and bare fruit long afterwards.

The Baptist here, or, rather, the Spirit by Whose inspiration he spoke, joins together a Lamb and the taking away of sin. Beyond all question, then, he must allude to a sacrificial Lamb, not a Lamb as gentle only, or innocent, or without spot merely; but one offered in Sacrifice. The next question is, what Sacrificial Lamb would have presented itself to the mind of the Jew? The Lamb had no place in the most striking of all strictly expiatory sacrifices, those on the great Day of Atonement. There were also the Lambs which were offered in the daily worship; but there was one Lamb indissolubly connected with the redemption of Israel, a Sacrificial Lamb, too, which would instantly present itself—nay, we were about to write, would exclusively present itself to the mind of an Israelite—the Paschal Lamb. This was the oldest Jewish Sacrifice. It was ordained before the giving of the Law. It was the national sin-offering, for its blood must be sprinkled (and the sprinkling of blood betokened atonement) on the lintel of every door; and then, as a peace-offering, be partaken of by every Israelite, in token of continued reconciliation.

Beyond all doubt, when a Jew thought of a Lamb associated with sacrifice, the Passover Lamb must first rise up before him. He might think of the daily Sacrifice, or of the Sufferer of Isaiah liii. compared to a Lamb; but his principal thought would be of the Paschal Lamb. He might at once repel the idea, as incapable of being associated with a human being, just as afterwards he energetically repelled the kindred idea of a Man giving His fellow-men His Flesh to eat; but if he submitted himself to the teaching of God, he would learn in due time that, of the man to whom John pointed, it could be said, "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us."

"Which taketh away the sin of the world"—taketh it away in

31 And I knew him not: but that he should be made manifest to Israel, [t] therefore am I come baptizing with water.

[t] Mal. iii. 1. Matt. iii. 6. Luke i. 17, 76, 77, & iii. 3, 4.

31. "With." Literally, "in water."

the sense of atoning for it; taketh it away in the sense of doing away with its power.

"Now He Who of old was dimly pictured the very Lamb, the spotless Sacrifice, is led to the slaughter for all, that He might drive away the sin of the world . . . . that He might be the beginning of all good to the nature of man, Deliverance from the imparted corruption, Bestower of Eternal Life, Foundation of our reconciliation to God, Beginning of Godliness and Righteousness, Way to the kingdom of heaven. For one Lamb died for all, saving the whole flock on earth to God the Father, One for all that He might subject all to God." (Cyril.)

30. "This is He of whom I said . . . . I knew him not." Can this mean, I have not known him personally, though He was a near relation? ["Thy cousin or kinswoman, Elizabeth," Luke i. 35.] It may have been so, for John was from his early youth in the deserts of Judea, and Jesus dwelt in Nazareth. And yet the beautiful representations of the Holy Family of Nazareth, and John, the early and only companion of the Child, need not have been the dreams of painters, for "I knew him not" seems perfectly reconcilable with a full personal knowledge as a man, and yet ignorance of His Divine Mission. The Baptist may have known him as a holy child and a youth of promise, so mighty in the Scriptures that He could hold His own against the doctors in the temple, and, realizing His extreme grace and goodness, may have even said, "I have need to be baptized of Thee," and yet he may have not till now known Him as the Christ, the Lamb of God. That knowledge was reserved for the day when he saw the Sign which God had promised—the Spirit descending and abiding,—marking out One Whom he had long known as wise and holy, but now recognized as the Christ, the Son of God.

"Therefore am I come baptizing with water." It would seem from this that the recognition of Christ by John at His Baptism, through the sign which God had promised, was the principal reason for John's baptizing. And it seems not unlikely that it should be

32 [u] And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him.

[u] Matt. iii. 16. Mark i. 10. Luke iii. 22. ch. v. 32.

33 And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, [x] the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.

[x] Matt. iii. 11. Acts i. 5. & ii. 4. & x. 44. & xix. 6.

32. "Like a dove." Properly, "as a dove." So most MSS.

so to those who thoroughly believe that Jesus was the Eternal Son and Word. For what was the baptism of all the rest compared to His, as a mark of submission to God? Jesus then condescended to be reckoned amongst sinners, and to receive in obedience to God's dispensation that which was designed for the cleansing of sinners; but through this the Baptist knew Him, and was able to point Him out as the Lamb of God, the Baptizer with the Holy Ghost, and to attach to Him His first disciples and apostles.

32. "I saw the Spirit descending." The truth and reality of the narrative requires that the appearance of the Spirit should be what we call objective, at least with reference to John. It was not a vision or cerebration. The appearance of the hovering Dove was the outward visible sign that Jesus was there and then anointed with the Holy Ghost to be the Prophet, Priest, and King of His people.

"It abode upon him . . . . remaining on Him." It was not a temporary inspiration, as with the prophets, to whom the Spirit of God came, and then left them when the purpose for which He inspired them was fulfilled. It was a permanent abiding in the human nature of the Lord. Then was fulfilled the words of the Prophet, "There shall come a Rod out of the stem of Jesse . . . . and the Spirit of the Lord shall *rest* upon Him" (Isaiah xi.), and those other words claimed by Jesus as said respecting Himself, "The Spirit of the Lord is *upon* me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor." (Luke iv. 18.)

33, 34. "The same is He which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God." In what sense Son of God? We answer, in the sense in which One must be Who is able to baptize with the Holy Ghost: not by a delegated power,

34 And I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God.

35 ¶ Again the next day after John stood, and two of his disciples;

36 And looking upon Jesus as he walked, he saith, [y] Behold the Lamb of God!

[y] ver. 29.

---

but by His own; not as a Servant, but as "the Son in His own house." Who can give one Person of the Trinity except Another? If the Lord in His own right, and by His own power, gave the Holy Spirit, then that Almighty and Divine Spirit Who is equal to Him in nature is subordinate to Him in the economy of grace.

This is the first acknowledgment of Jesus as the Son, and it is the root and foundation of all after confessions of His Sonship.

35-42. "Again the next day after John stood, and two of his disciples," &c. If in any narrative of Holy Scripture we have all the signs of the testimony being that of an eye-witness, and an observant eye-witness, it is in these verses. Notice, first, the indications of time. It was the next day. It was about the tenth hour. He *first* findeth. Then the notices of the deportment of both the Baptist and Jesus. John was standing: he was *looking* upon Jesus, as He *walked*. The two heard Him speak. Jesus turned. They accosted Him as "Rabbi," which word St. John, then writing in Ephesus, thinks it needful to explain. They came, saw, abode, &c. They both went to seek their brother. One finds his brother *first*, then Jesus *beheld* him as if He looked into His inmost soul.

Every incident, no matter how apparently trifling, seems to have made an indelible impression, for the "other" of the two, the one besides Andrew, was beyond all doubt the Evangelist himself. It was the great day of His life, this day of His introduction to Jesus; from this his new life dated. From henceforth he is a different man; for on this day he heard, he saw with his eyes, he looked upon, perhaps his hands handled Him Whom afterwards he proclaimed and worshipped as the "Word of Life."

He saith, "Behold the Lamb of God . . and the two disciples heard him speak, and they followed Jesus." Chrysostom remarks well that when John spake of the greatness of Jesus, he caught no one, no one began to follow Jesus; but when he began to speak of the dispensation of mercy and forgiveness in the words, "Be-

37 And the two disciples heard him speak, and they followed Jesus.

38 Then Jesus turned, and saw them following, and saith unto them, What seek ye? They said unto him, Rabbi, (which is to say, being interpreted, Master,) where || dwellest thou?

‖ Or, *abidest.*

---

hold the Lamb of God," then the disciples followed Him, and he goes on to say, in golden words indeed: "We may remark this, not only in the instance of the disciples, but that the many are not so much attracted when some great and sublime thing is said concerning God, as when some act of graciousness and loving-kindness, something pertaining to the salvation of the hearers, is spoken of. They heard that He taketh away the sin of the world, and straightway they ran to Him. For, said they, it is not possible to wash away the charges that lie against us, why do we delay? Here is One Who will deliver us without labour of ours. Is it not extreme folly to put off accepting the gift?"

It is a very noticeable fact indeed that His first followers were won to Jesus by the proclamation of His Atoning Sacrifice.

37. "And the two disciples heard him speak, and they followed Jesus." Perhaps they had heard him before when he said the same words, now at this second hearing they heard him effectually, for they followed Jesus. They were the noblest fruits of the Baptist's mission. By winning them to Jesus, he had won those who in God's election were to be the princes of the kingdom of heaven.

In thus hearing the Baptist and at once following Jesus, they remind us of the words of that prayer of Christ. "Thine they were, and Thou gavest them Me."

38. "Jesus turned, and saw them following, and saith unto them, What seek ye?" This was a trial question. Perhaps the manner of the question and the tone of voice would try them still more; but their answer was that they desired to know Him and abide with Him; and they were accepted—"Come and see."

"Rabbi, where dwellest thou?" The salutation of "Rabbi" seems to show that they accepted Him as a teacher, and desired to sit at His feet, and this at once; so they asked Him, Where abidest Thou? that we may without delay come to Thee and learn of Thee.

39. "They abode with him that day, for it was about the tenth hour." The word "for" is probably spurious: they did not abide

39 He saith unto them, Come and see. They came and saw where he dwelt, and abode with him that day: for it was || about the tenth hour.

|| *That was two hours before night.*

40 One of the two which heard John *speak*, and followed him, was [z] Andrew, Simon Peter's brother.

[z] Matt. iv. 18.

41 He first findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him, We have found the Messias, which is, being interpreted, || the Christ.

|| Or, *the Anointed.*

39. "For" omitted by ℵ, A., B., C., L., and most authorities.

because of the lateness of the day, for most commentators think that St. John here and elsewhere begins the reckoning of the hours of the day with midnight, consequently the time would be our ten o'clock. If so, they continued a long day with Him, because they were entranced with what He taught them.

40, 41. "One of the two which heard John speak, and followed him, was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother." "He first findeth," or he findeth first, as if both the disciples had their brothers there, and desired that they should partake of their happiness; but Andrew found *first* his brother Simon.

"And saith unto him, We have found the Messias."

How did they know Him? Not through John's testimony only, but because of their own prolonged interview. From the power and grace with which He spake they were convinced that no prophet, no teacher or Rabbi, no messenger of God, could approach to Him in point of wisdom. It is very important to notice what it was which convinced them. It was no miracle; though one afterwards established their faith. It must have been the grace with which He spake, the new light He threw on Scripture, the way in which His words met and satisfied the deepest yearnings of their spirits.

"We have found the Messias." Such an expression shows that they had been seeking Him. They were of those who were "looking for the Consolation of Israel." For this word "we have found" is the expression of a soul which travails for His presence, and looks for His coming from above, and is overjoyed when the looked-for thing has happened, and hastens to impart to others the good tidings.

42 And he brought him to Jesus. And when Jesus beheld him, he said, Thou art Simon the son of Jona: [a] thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation, || A stone.

[a] Matt. xvi. 18.
|| Or, *Peter*.

43 ¶ The day following Jesus would go forth into Galilee, and findeth Philip, and saith unto him, Follow me.

---

42. "Jona." So A., later Uncials, nearly all Cursives, some old Latin (c, q), Vulg. and Syriacs; but ℵ, B., L., 33, some old Latin (a, b, f, ff², l), Vulg. (Cod. Amiat.), Copt., Æth., read "John."

43. "Would go forth." "Willed" or "was minded" to go forth.

That Andrew should come to his brother Simon with such words implies that he also had been earnestly looking for the expected Messiah.

42. "When Jesus beheld him, he said." "Beheld," that is, looked earnestly on him, which on the part of One Who searches the hearts, meant "looked him through and through." "Thou art Simon the son of Jona," or John (as the Vatican and that class of MSS. read). The Lord then did a thing which on some very solemn crisis in a man's life God Himself did. He changed the name which Simon had received at his circumcision, or added another to it indicative of what He, the Searcher of hearts, saw to be his true character. "Thou shalt be called Cephas, which is, by interpretation, Peter, *i.e.*, a stone." Christ was the rock, and Simon now became a living stone of that rock. (See note on Matt. xvi. 18.)

The reader need scarcely be reminded of the relation of this first calling of the leading disciple to the account in St. Matthew iv. 19-23. Here Simon, Andrew, John, and probably James are called to faith and discipleship, there they are called to the ministry. "Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men." Afterwards they are selected to be Apostles. (Matthew x. 1, 2.) The account in St. Matthew requires to be supplemented and explained by this in St. John, for from St. Matthew's account we learn nothing of any previous knowledge which the Apostles had of Jesus to fit them for the office. From St. John's account we gather that they had been earnest disciples of the Baptist, and were looking for the Messiah, Whose near approaching Advent he preached so earnestly that the moment he pointed out Jesus as the Lamb of God they followed Him.

43. "The day following Jesus would go forth." should be trans-

44 Now [b] Philip was of Bethsaida, the city of Andrew and Peter.

45 Philip findeth [c] Nathanael, and saith unto him, We have found him, of whom [d] Moses in the law, and the [e] prophets, did write, Jesus [f] of Nazareth, the son of Joseph.

[b] ch. xii. 21.
[c] ch. xxi. 2.
[d] Gen. iii. 15. & xlix. 10. Deut. xviii. 18. See on Luke xxiv. 27.
[e] Is. iv. 2 & vii. 14. & ix. 6. & liii. 2. Mic. v. 2. Zech. vi. 12. & ix. 9. See more on Luke xxiv. 27.
[f] Matt. ii. 23. Luke ii. 4.

---

lated "willed to go forth," or "was minded to go forth." "And findeth Philip, and saith unto him, Follow me." Notice here that the Lord allowed the other three disciples to seek Him. With this man Philip He makes the first advance by inviting him to follow Him. The Lord saw each man's most secret heart, whether, being too forward, he required warning of the cost, or too backward, he required to be summoned or encouraged. (See Matth. viii. 19-22.)

44. "Bethsaida." This is Bethsaida, on the western bank of the lake. There was another, Bethsaida Julias, at the north end. It is supposed to be mentioned to show that all the first-called disciples were Galileans. This was, perhaps, more needful in the case of Philip, as his name is a Gentile name.

45. "Philip findeth Nathanael." There can be little doubt but that Nathanael is the same person as Bartholomew: Nathanael being his usual, or as we should say, his Christian name; Bartholomew, *i.e.*, son of Tolmai, his patronymic. In this Gospel xxi. 2, he is classed with Apostles as distinguished from "other of our Lord's disciples." The circumstances of his call, so early and so mixed up with the call of undoubted Apostles, lead to the same conclusion. And this becomes a certainty when we compare these notices in this Gospel with the lists in the Synoptics, in each of which Bartholomew is associated with Philip, who is here the means of his being brought to Jesus.

"We have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write." "Moses in the law," particularly in Deut. xviii. 18 ("I will raise up unto them a prophet," &c.), also Gen. iii. 15, (the seed of the woman bruising the serpent's head), and Gen. xlix. 10, (He to Whom is to be the gathering of the people.) And we should

46 And Nathanael said unto him, [g] Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth? Philip saith unto him, Come and see.

[g] ch. vii. 41, 42, 52.

47 Jesus saw Nathanael coming to him, and saith of him, Behold [h] an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile!

[h] Ps. xxxii. 2 & lxxiii. 1. ch. viii. 39. Rom. ii. 28, 29 & ix. 6.

---

suppose that the teaching of the Baptist had led them to consider this prophet as the antitype of the Lamb of the Passover, and of the Lamb brought to the slaughter, of Isaiah.

It is noticeable how the peculiarities of mind of different commentators lead them to draw directly opposite conclusions from very simple words. Milligan writes: "There is an advance in fulness on the confession of verse 41, and the special character of the advance is important, it helps to explain the words of the following verses." Whereas Godet, quoting with approval Luthardt, writes: "Luthardt finally points out the dull and complicated form of Philip's profession, those long considerations, that Messianic certificate in full form, which contrasts with the lively and unembarrassed style of Andrew's profession" (ver. 41). But surely it seems right to give reasons from God's word for the recognition of such an One as the Messiah. The words of the Evangelist seems clearly to indicate an advance.

"Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph. And Nathanael said unto him, Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?" That Nazareth was, for some reason unknown to us, held to be a peculiarly contemptible place, is evident from the inscription on the Cross, "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews." Perhaps also the words of the lost prophecy, "He shall be called a Nazarene," were spoken as foretelling that He would be held in contempt on account of his supposed birthplace.

47. "Jesus saw Nathanael . . . in whom is no guile" Our Lord means by this that Nathanael was an honest-minded man, who would allow no secondary considerations to hide the truth from his mind; who, when he saw any clear indication of God's will and guiding hand, would not shrink from following it, no matter where it led him. This was perfectly consistent with his having prejudices, as when he asked, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" but his honesty of purpose made him instantly dismiss all such

48 Nathanael saith unto him, Whence knowest thou me? Jesus answered and said unto him, Before that Philip called thee, when thou wast under the fig tree, I saw thee.

i Matt. xiv. 33.
k Matt. xxi. 5. & xxvii. 11, 42. ch. xviii. 37. & xix. 3.

49 Nathanael answered and saith unto him, Rabbi, [i] thou art the Son of God; thou art [k] the King of Israel.

---

prejudices in the face of a single proof of the Lord's supernatural knowledge.

48. "Before that Philip called thee, when thou wast under the fig-tree, I saw thee." What Nathanael was doing under the fig-tree it is futile now to conjecture. Some have supposed that he retired there for prayer; some that he was reading the Scriptures, and meditating upon what he read, and they even go so far as to surmise that the place of Scripture was probably the account of Jacob's ladder, because of our Lord's promise that "he should see heaven open and the angels of God ascending and descending on the Son of man." Whatever be the truth of the matter, it is clear that Nathanael instantly perceived that if our Lord knew what had happened under the fig-tree He knew all things; just as the woman of Samaria, when our Lord told her some of the leading facts of her evil life, invited her neighbours to come and see Him with the words, "Come, see a man who told me all things whatsoever I did. Is not this the Christ?"

And so with Nathanael. Jesus was the Truth, and every one who was of the truth would infallibly hear and recognize His voice. Nathanael was "of the truth," and so he was ready to welcome a sign from God which a man of more guile would have questioned. His own guilelessness would prevent him saying in himself, "This Man knows this fact accidentally, or he has guessed it, or he has some secret information about it, and so I must see carefully what I do before I acknowledge him." He received at once what would have been to others very slender evidence, but which was to him, through his very honesty and truthfulness, a certain sign of the Messiahship of Jesus.

49. "Thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel." Most commentators identify the Son of God with the Messiah, from the second Psalm, where the Lord's "anointed" and the "King set upon the holy hill of Zion," is afterwards addressed in the words, "Thou

50 Jesus answered and said unto him, Because I said unto thee, I saw thee under the fig tree, believest thou? thou shalt see greater things than these.

---

art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee." The confession of Nathanael, however, seems too warm and too unpremeditated to have been a deduction from passages of the Old Testament. "The word 'Son' of God expresses in the mouth of Nathanael the feelings, still very vague, it is true, but immediately resulting from what has just passed, of an exceptional relation between Jesus and God. But vague as this impression is, it is, nevertheless, rich and full, like everything which is matter of feeling, more even, perhaps, than if it were already reduced to a dogmatic formula. As Luthardt observes, 'Nathanael's faith will never possess more than it embraces at this moment,' the living person of Jesus. It will only be able to possess it more distinctly. The gold-seeker puts his hands on an ingot; when he has coined it, he has it better for use, but not more precious metal. The two titles complete one another. *Son of God* bears on the relation of Jesus to God; King of Israel on his relation to the chosen people. The second title is the logical consequence of the first. The person who is in so intimate a relation to God, can only be the King of Israel, the Messiah." (Godet.)

50. "Because I said unto thee, I saw thee under the fig tree, believest thou?" There seems to be in these words something of that marvel with which the Son of God regarded the faith of the centurion. (Matt. viii. 10.) Usually He had to rebuke men for unbelief. Now He praised this "Israelite indeed" for his faith, and promised that "to him that hath shall more be given." "Thou shalt see greater things than these."

What are these greater things?

51. "And he saith unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto you, hereafter shall ye see heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man."

The Lord here, of course, refers to Jacob's vision, and it is supposed by some that this was suggested by the fact that they were then near to Bethel or Mahanaim.

There has been some difficulty made as to what is alluded to in the history of our Lord's sojourn on earth answering to Jacob's vision, for our Lord evidently refers to something occurring in the world

51 And he saith unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto you, [1]Hereafter ye shall see heaven open,

[1] Gen. xxviii. 12. Matt. iv. 11. Luke ii. 9, 13. & xxii. 43. & xxiv. 4. Acts i. 10.

of time and sense, and not to a mere extension of such intercourse between God in heaven and man, as had been enjoyed by the prophets and all true servants of God in all times. There were several periods in our Lord's life in which angels visibly appeared. Two of these—the appearance to the shepherds, and the ministration after the temptation—were already past. One at the time of the Agony was very secret, seen probably only by Himself. The appearances at the sepulchre can scarcely be meant. Owing to the difficulty of interpreting the place of visible appearance of angels, it has come to pass that many modern commentators explain it of reconciliation with God. "We have simply a symbolical representation of the fact that through the Incarnation and Sufferings of Jesus heaven is opened, is brought into the closest and most constant fellowship with earth, so that the latter is itself transfigured with the glory of God's special abode."

But it may help us to a better understanding of this place to remember that, in the Vision of the Patriarch, the angels descended not on himself, but on the ladder. The Person of Christ, the Incarnate Word, Son of God and Son of Man, is the ladder, the channel of communication between the highest throne of God and the lowest place on earth where a saint of God can dwell. The Divine Nature of Jesus is in the Bosom of the Father; His human nature is present in the Church, and it is through this that we are far more interested in the ministrations of angelic beings than some of us like to acknowledge. It is to be remembered that the references to the unseen ministrations of angels, and also to their outward visible appearances are far more numerous in the New Testament than in the Old, considering the relative lengths of the two books; and, no doubt, numbers of visions and appearances (openings of heaven) occurred, of which all accounts are at present lost to us. There are a considerable number of references to angels in St. Paul's Epistles, which show us clearly that he considered the presence and ministrations of angels not a devout and poetical imagination, but a part of the actual Divine system of the Church. He believed that the suffering Apostles were a spectacle, not to men only, but to angels (1 Corinth. iv. 9), he charged St. Timothy to rule the Church impartially be-

and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man.

---

fore God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, *and the elect angels* (1 Tim. v. 21), (let the reader try to conceive any bishop now putting such a thing into his Charge, and he will be able to judge how faith in the nearness of the unseen has declined); he would have women wear a covering in Church "because of the angels." (1 Cor. xi. 10.) It is, with him, within the range of possibility that he should speak with the tongue of angels. (1 Cor. xiii.) It is part of the mystery of godliness that the Incarnate Lord should be "seen of angels." (1 Tim. iii. 16.) The Church in her present state is assumed to have come to an innumerable company of angels. (Hebrews xii. 21.)

Now all this is, of course, a far greater thing than any single vision of angels descending on Christ which Nathanael may have been privileged to see. It denotes a permanent difference between the relations of earth and heaven: not only its King, but all its inhabitants being brought infinitely nearer by the Incarnation, by the Word dwelling amongst us as the Son of Man.

"Son of Man." The highest meaning must be necessarily assigned to this phrase. He is the Son of Man, so that He should gather into Himself, and represent, and be sponsor for, all the race. It really involves that He is the Second Adam, the Second Man, the "Lord from heaven."

CHAP. II.

AND the third day there was a marriage in [a] Cana of Galilee; and the mother of Jesus was there:

[a] See Josh. xix. 28.

---

1. "And the third day," *i.e.*, the third day after Jesus set out from the place Bethany, or Bethabara, where John had witnessed to Him. "There was a marriage:" literally a marriage feast, which lasted seven days.

"In Cana of Galilee;" never mentioned except as Cana of Galilee (so ch. iv. 46, xxi. 2), probably to distinguish it from the Cana or Kanah, which pertained to the tribe of Asher, near Zidon

2 And both Jesus was called, and his disciples, to the marriage.

3 And when they wanted wine, the mother of Jesus saith unto him, They have no wine.

---

3. "When they wanted wine." Literally, "When wine failed;" *deficiente vino.* (Vulg.)

(Joshua xix. 28). Its name most probably lingers in Kana-el-Jelel, a village a few miles to the north of Nazareth.

"The mother of Jesus was there." It is to be remarked that St. John never mentions her by name, and designates her only by that which made her "highly favoured," "blessed among women," as the mother of Jesus. In his mention of her place near the cross, he speaks of her only as the Mother of Jesus, and notices by name the other Maries.

From the expression "she was there," *i.e.*, at or from the first, whereas Jesus and His disciples were "called," it has been conjectured, with some show of reason, that she was there by a sort of right, as the other relations of the bridegroom or bride. From the presence of Joseph, her husband, not being noticed on such an occasion, it is inferred with certainty that the holy saint had been called to his rest.

2. "And both Jesus was called, and his disciples, to the marriage." From the fact that the disciples were called apparently as the disciples of Jesus, we gather that He had begun already to be recognized amongst His friends as a prophet or great teacher, Who would gather disciples after Him, and that they or some of them would accompany Him whithersoever He went.

3. "And when they wanted wine, the mother of Jesus said unto him, They have no wine." Notice, again, how the Evangelist avoids naming her by her name.

"They have no wine." It is more difficult than appears at first sight to ascertain the intent of these words. Some German critics have supposed that they were a hint to our Lord to supply wine in the ordinary way by sending for it to those who sold it. I mention this to show to what lengths unbelievers will go in order to strip the account of everything Divine, and reduce it to a commonplace narrative such as we might find in a modern newspaper. Some have made a difficulty about the words, as suggesting a miracle, because hitherto our Lord had done no miracles. But we

4 Jesus saith unto her, [b] Woman, [c] what have I to do with thee? [d] mine hour is not yet come.

[b] ch. xix. 26.
[c] So 2 Sam. xvi. 10. & xix. 22.
[d] ch. vii. 6.

4. "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" Literally, "What to me and to thee?" The English Translation suggests an harshness absolutely foreign to the original.

are to remember that she who said, "They have no wine," was one who, apparently beyond all in that generation, "pondered" the sayings of her Divine Son, and "kept" them in her heart. (Luke ii. 51.) She would keep in her heart the memory of the angelic salutation, of her converse with Elisabeth, of the inspiration wherewith she poured forth the Magnificat, of the wisdom with which the Divine Child was filled, and the Grace of God which was upon Him; and now, having been told of the witness of John and of the spell which Jesus had exercised over the first-called disciples, and of the supernatural knowledge He had shown with reference to Nathanael, who, be it remembered, was "of Cana," we see that she would, whether she definitely expected a miracle or not, naturally and spontaneously turn to her Divine Son in this perplexity.

The answer of Jesus, "Woman, what have I to do with thee? mine hour is not yet come," has, it is to be remembered, nothing whatsoever of the harshness which in our translation it seems to carry.

In the first place, the term "woman" has nothing in it approaching to disrespect. On the contrary, it is more than once associated with great praise, "O woman, great is thy faith." (Matth. xv. 28. It is the word used by our Lord respecting His mother in the words on the cross, by which He committed her to the care of St. John.[1]

"What have I to do with thee?" Literally, "what to me and to thee?" In the English the words, "What have I to with thee?" sound as harshly as possible, as if there was nothing in common between our Lord and His mother. Both in the Hebrew and the Greek, however, it signifies nothing more than a prohibition of

[1] The Greek word woman (γυναι) is used at times with the greatest respect. Thus, in Iliad, xxiv. 30, Priam says to Hecuba, Ὦ γύναι, οὐ μέν τοι τόδ' ἀφαμέρην ἀπιθήσω. Also *mulier*, applied to Livia, in Horace, Odes, iii. 14, 5, "Unico gaudens mulier marito."

5 His mother saith unto the servants, Whatsoever he saith unto you, do *it*.

interference; thus in 2 Sam. xvi. 10, they are a prohibition to the sons of Zeruiah not to interfere by punishing Shimei who was cursing David.

But though in the original there is no such harshness in the phrase as there is in our version, it is undoubtedly an admonition to the Blessed Virgin to keep within her proper province, and an intimation that all Divine action on His part, as in the performing of miracles, or in making known the Gospel, is to be in no respect subject to her control. It expresses the point of a new departure. The Son of God is henceforth no longer to be the member of a private family, deferring to the head of the household, but the Christ of God, doing all things, and choosing the hour for doing them, according to the secret announcements of the Will of His Father.

"Mine hour is not yet come." From the way in which these words are understood by the Virgin, they must have clearly meant that he intended to come in some way to the help of the bridegroom, and so that everything might be ready for furthering His Divine action, "His mother saith unto the servants, Whatsoever he saith unto you, do it." The significance of this is not perceived unless we remember that, humanly speaking, one of the conditions for the performance of this miracle, as our Lord willed it, was the implicit obedience of the servants. When, then, His mother said this to the servants, she must have expected some action on the part of our Lord, similar to what actually took place, or there must have been some further communication between them respecting what He was about to do. This is perfectly compatible with the intimation He had given to her respecting their new relative positions. As soon as she had wisely and meekly received and submitted to this, it was quite open to Him to intimate to her that something very great would come to pass, if there was no hesitation in obeying His orders. A very little consideration will serve to convince the reader that these three circumstances—the position of the Blessed Virgin at the feast, so that the servants should receive directions from her; the giving of this command even after the mild admonition she received: and the ready obedience of the servants, were part of the Divine ordering for the performance of the miracle.

6 And there were set there six waterpots of stone, ' after the manner of the purifying of the Jews, con- e Mark vii. 3.
taining two or three firkins apiece.

7 Jesus saith unto them, Fill the waterpots with water. And they filled them up to the brim.

8 And he saith unto them, Draw out now, and bear unto the governor of the feast. And they bare *it*.

---

8. "Governor." Not, as some think, an upper servant, but one of the guests chosen to preside.

6. "And there were set there six waterpots of stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews, containing two or three firkins apiece." These waterpots must have been placed in the court, otherwise the ruler of the feast would have seen the servants drawing the wine from them, and could not have been said to have been ignorant of where the wine came from.

"After the manner of the purifying of the Jews." If the feast was a considerable one, a great quantity of water must have been required; for we read, "The Pharisees and all the Jews except they wash their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders." (Mark vii. 3.)

"Containing two or three firkins apiece."

Each firkin being between eight and nine gallons, the six must have held between 120 and 150 gallons.

7. "Jesus saith unto them, Fill the waterpots with water. And they filled them up to the brim." As in all probability this was towards the conclusion of the feast, the water would not have been wanted for purposes of purification. So we see here the reason why the Virgin gave the explicit order, "Whatsoever He saith unto you, do it." The servants might have wondered why, when no more purification was needed, they were required to draw, perhaps from some distance, 150 gallons of water, and pour them into the vessels set for purposes of ceremonial washing.

8. "And he saith unto them, Draw out now, and bear unto the governor of the feast. And they bare it. When the ruler of the feast had tasted the water which was made wine." Between the filling of the waterpots and the word to the servants to "draw out, and bear unto the governor," the miracle had taken place, and the water had become wine. There can be no doubt but that the whole

[t] ch. iv. 46. 9 When the ruler of the feast had tasted [t] the

contents of the six waterpots was changed into wine. If the water in one or two of them only had been changed, as some commentators hint, or if the water in the pots remained unchanged, and only became wine in the smaller vessels in which the servants conveyed it to the governor and the guests, then it is impossible to account for the mention of the large capacity of the vessels. The miracle in respect of the abundance produced resembles that of the feeding of the multitudes with the loaves and fishes, where, instead of the exact quantity required being nicely calculated, a far larger quantity of food was left in the shape of fragments than was originally operated upon. So here a very large surplus of good wine remained as a generous present for the bride and bridegroom.

In all His miracles the Lord wrought bountifully. There was a vast multitude of fishes enclosed in the net. He healed vast multitudes. The raging tempest was stilled at once into a great calm.

The objection that, by the production of so much wine, the Lord encouraged excess, seems not to deserve serious notice. In this miracle of grace the Lord acted as He does in the works of nature. An abundance is produced, which men may use or may abuse. It is part of their probation to use all God's gifts to His glory. The very gifts of the Spirit may be abused. (1 Cor. xiv.) The grace of God itself may be received in vain.[1]

[1] A singular account of this miracle is given in the "Speaker's Commentary." The servants, it is there said, are commanded first to fill the waterpots as if for purposes of purification, though we should suppose that when the wine ran short the feast would have been at its height, and the guests would have purified themselves at the beginning; then, when those vessels are filled, it is supposed that the servants are directed to go to the same well from which they drew the water to fill the six waterpots, and to bear direct from the well to the governor of the feast and the guests; in which case the water in the waterpots would have remained unchanged, and only the additional water drawn from the well, when these vessels were filled, would have become wine. But surely on such an hypothesis, the principal guarantee afforded by the Lord Himself for the good faith of the miracle, would be lost. Wine might have

water that was made wine, and knew not whence it was:

---

9. "Was made;" or, "that had become."

The miracle also was perfect as regards the quality of the wine, as appears from the remark of the Master of the Feast to the bridegroom, "Thou hast kept the good wine until now."

When "men have well drunk" does not necessarily mean that they have drunk to excess; though unquestionably it may be used in that sense.

Three matters connected with this miracle must be considered.

The first is, the mode in which our Lord brought the change about. The second, the intention He had in performing it at that time, and in that company. The third, its mystical or prophetical import.

(1.) How did the Lord bring the change about? This seems a presumptuous question, but it must be put and answered, and the answer, though it explains nothing of the mode of the Divine action, shows us clearly to what department of that action it belongs. The Lord must have wrought the change by His all-pervading, all-penetrating power as a Divine Spiritual Existence bringing His will to bear on every particle of the water so as to give it new qualities. If God has any power at all, not merely as God, but as a Spirit, He must have this. The real question is, Is there a God, and can He work at all? If He can work at all, the least of His workings must be infinitely above our comprehension. We can only conceive of the mode of working of creatures like ourselves, having hands and fingers moved by muscular action, which action depends upon the connection of the muscles with the brain by means of nerves. By such working we can operate only on the outside of things, whereas

---

been kept in any other vessels except these waterpots, which, holding water for purifying purposes, could never have been put to any other use. The only reason alleged for this new view of the matter is that the word "draw" is used for drawing water with a bucket out of a well; but, on turning to the lexicons, we find its primary meaning is to bale water, as out of a ship, which is most fitting to express the ladling of liquor out of a larger vessel into a smaller one. On this new view, the mention of the waterpots at all is irrelevant.

(but the servants which drew the water knew;) the governor of the feast called the bridegroom,

---

God has no such limitation to His action. He is not encumbered in carrying out His will, as we are, by the weakness and clumsiness and imperfection of human limbs; He brings His whole power to bear directly and instantaneously on whatsoever He desires to move, or to change, or to order in any way. So that the Saviour exercised this all-pervading power over every particle of the water in a way perfectly simple and direct.

It has been said that in turning this water into wine the Saviour only shortened a process which He is bringing to pass each year in every vineyard, where the moisture from the earth is transmuted by slow, insensible degrees into the juice of the grape, and then by the process of fermentation, equally natural, into generous wine. This is called the "natural" process, whereas such a miracle as this of Cana is supernatural; but before allowing this we must call attention to the way in which we use the word "natural." Natural is according to nature: but the nature of what? It is according to the nature of insensible things, such as stocks and stones, to be acted upon. It is according to the nature of the lower creatures to act only in the preservation of their existence. It is the nature of man to act according to reason and free will, and also according to the Divine Light. What is the action, the natural action, so to speak, of God? The action of an infinitely powerful Spirit must be under no limitations such as we are under. It must be instantaneous, direct, unimpeded, irresistible, reaching to the very essence of the thing it acts upon. It can be limited by no conditions of mere matter, except for our sakes, because God has Himself imposed these conditions. So that here we have, to speak most reverently, the natural action of God—of the Word, *i.e.* the action according to the limitless power of His all-pervading Spiritual Essence; whereas in the production of wine according to the course of nature, He has imposed conditions on His acting; such conditions being the presence of moisture, the presence of decayed but once living substance which can be sucked up with that moisture and be suitable nourishment, the faculty of fibrous roots for seeking and imbibing that nourishment which can produce wood, leaves, and grapes; the course of the seasons, the warmth of the sun, the descent of the rain, the winds and eyes of

10 And saith unto him, Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine; and when men have well drunk, then that which is worse: *but* thou hast kept the good wine until now.

---

men to watch the process, and their hands to gather the grapes, press out the juice, and preserve it in fitting vessels.

So that in this miracle we have the manifestation of the glory of the Word somewhat as it is described in Hebrews iv.: "The Word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit and of the joints and marrow;" only in this latter place we have the searching power over the human subject, but in this miracle we have the same searching power acting upon the ultimate particles of matter, combining, perhaps re-arranging, accelerating processes, adding new qualities, such as sweetness and strength, and even mellowness, to what was weak, insipid, and worthless.

(2.) The next question is, The intention which our Lord had in performing it at that time and in that company.

It was apparently the first work of His ministry. It was done primarily to convince and attach more firmly His disciples to Himself. They had begun to believe in Him, and to follow Him without having seen a miracle done by Him. They looked upon Him, no doubt, as the great Teacher of Israel; but He was about to make far greater demands on their faith. He was about to set Himself before them and demand their faith as the Regenerator, the Creator of the New Creation, the Maker of all things anew, and so that they might accept Him and not start back when He set before them the deepest mysteries of the coming kingdom, He gave them, as it were, a foretaste of His power. He had not yet called them to forsake all and follow Him, but He would soon do so, and no doubt the experience of this marvel made them the more ready to follow at once when the further call came. This, no doubt, was the one great reason for His working this mighty work; and it was successful. "He manifested forth His glory, and His disciples believed on Him."

Certain other lessons are also taught us. The Church teaches us that herein He honoured marriage, that holy estate which "Christ adorned and beautified with His presence, and first miracle that He wrought in Cana of Galilee." And by His presence at this feast

11 This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee,
s ch. i. 14. s and manifested forth his glory; and his disciples
believed on him.

---

11. "Miracles;" rather, "signs." *Initium signorum* (Vulg.); *hoc est signum primum* (Syriac).

Christ, Who was emphatically the Man of Sorrows, showed us how He sympathizes with the joys, the pure and holy joys, as well as with the sorrows of His brethren. In almost all other passages of His life He weeps with them that weep. Here, for once, He rejoices with them that rejoice, and even by His Divine power furthers their joy.

Olshausen mentions another reason, which I will give in his own words:—"The first disciples of Christ were all originally disciples of the Baptist. His manner of life—a rigid penitential austerity, and solitary abode in the desert—naturally appeared to them the only one that was right. What a contrast for them when the Messiah, to Whom the Baptist himself had pointed them, leads them first of all to a marriage! Whilst John dedicated them to a life of self-denial, Christ conducts them to enjoyment."

Now there is a shadow of truth about this, but the inference of the last sentence is utterly, miserably false. Christ, it is quite true, says of the Baptist, "He came neither eating nor drinking," and of Himself that "the Son of Man came eating and drinking." The Baptist lived in the desert, and Christ lived in towns, and went to feasts. But surely Christ dedicated His Apostles to a life of self-denial, when He said, "He that will come after Me must deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow Me;" when He said, "Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses;" when He said, "Ye shall weep and lament, but the world shall rejoice."

(3.) The third consideration respecting this miracle is its mystical, or, as we may say, prophetical element. Of this miracle it may truly be said, that it was not done for the sake of the bridegroom or of the guests, or even for the sake of the disciples, but for us, for the Church in all ages.

For in this sign we have the adumbration of that great change which is wrought in the Kingdom of God, the change of the weak and beggarly elements of Judaism, or of the Law, or of the Old

12 ¶ After this he went down to Capernaum, he, and his mother, and [h] his brethren, and his disciples: and they continued there not many days.

[h] Matt. xii. 46

13 ¶ [i] And the Jews' passover was at hand, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem,

[i] Ex. xii. 14. Deut. xvi. 1, 16. ver. 23. ch. v. 1. & vi. 4. & xi. 55.

14 [k] And found in the temple those that sold oxen and sheep and doves, and the changers of money sitting:

[k] Matt. xxi. 12. Mark xi. 15. Luke xix. 45.

Testament, into the strong, sweet, generous, exhilarating wine of the Gospel. "Old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." There is a new life, even the Life of the Word Incarnate, the Second Adam. There is a new birth into His mystical body—a new circumcision, that of the Spirit. There are new Scriptures, which set forth the all-perfect example and teaching of the God-man. There is a new Sacrifice, the all-sufficient Sacrifice of the Lamb of God, and a new and living way of setting forth and partaking of that Sacrifice, even the Eucharistic Memorial. There is a new priesthood, in which men ordained by the Spirit directly represent the one Eternal Priest. There is a new fellowship, in which all men are one in Christ. There is a new hope, even of the Second Coming, and the Resurrection of the Body in the likeness of His glorious Body. The Fathers are full of this mystical, yet most true meaning. St. Augustine carries it to excess when he makes the six waterpots to betoken long periods between the Creation and Christ, and shows how the prophecies or types of these Old Testament periods have new life and a new meaning given to them by our understanding them of Christ.

12. "After this he went down to Capernaum." He went down. Capernaum being nearer to the lake than Cana or Nazareth, His going there is a descent. This was not the dwelling in Capernaum alluded to in Matthew iv. 13, which took place after John was cast into prison, which must have been long after this temporary sojourn in that city.

13. "And the Jews' passover was at hand, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem." This was the first passover which He attended, as we may say, ministerially. There can be little doubt but that He Who thus honoured the Law and the Temple would have attended at every passover, though we may have no record of each attendance;

15 And when he had made a scourge of small cords, he drove them all out of the temple, and the sheep, and the oxen; and poured out the changers' money, and overthrew the tables;

---

inasmuch as the account of not one hundredth part of His life is preserved to us.

14, 16. "And found in the temple. . . Take these things hence; make not my Father's house an house of merchandise." This is the first cleansing of the Temple, and took place at the beginning of His ministry, as the second took place at the end of it. Is there any difference in their significance? Undoubtedly this first cleansing was an assertion of His authority as the Son of God, to vindicate the honour of the service of His own proper Father: for whereas in the second cleansing He simply quotes the words of a prophet of God as His authority ["It is written, My house shall be called," &c.], here He sets forth His own authority as the Son, "Make not my Father's house an house of merchandise." The claims which He asserts here are not only Messianic, but Divine. "The Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: he shall come, saith the Lord of Hosts, but who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? . . . and he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver," &c. (Mal. iii. 1-3.) In this His first public act, then, He honoured the service of God, and maintained the sacredness of the very building in which it was offered. But we shall lose much of the significance of this act if we forget the part of the Temple which He cleansed. It was not the Holy Place or Sanctuary, not the Court of the Priests, not even the Court of Israel, but the Court of the Gentiles, which the iniquitous rulers of the Temple considered as only half sacred, and so scrupled not to farm out its area for the sale of things required in sacrifice, and for the change of coin which, being defiled with the image of the Emperor, could not be lawfully put into the treasury. So here we have the first assertion of the equality of all men in Himself. The place where believing Gentiles worshipped, and by consequence the worship which they offered, was as precious in the sight of God as that of His chosen people. Here, then, we have the strongest vindication conceivable of the principle that all that is dedicated to God, all that has to do with His service, is holy, and to be separated from

16 And said unto them that sold doves, Take these things hence; make not [1] my Father's house an house of merchandise. [1] Luke ii. 49.

all worldly profit, even though a religious intention may be pleaded, as here when the sheep and oxen were sold for sacrifice. It is evident by His conduct in the matter of the cleansing of the Temple, that our Lord would reprobate all letting of the area of a church in pews for the exclusive possession of the rich, all trafficking in livings, all bestowal of preferment in exchange for political support.[1]

This act of Christ was, of course, supernatural. The expulsion of a multitude of profane and greedy traffickers with their cattle, from a market-place in which they possessed places assigned to them by those who had legal possession of the whole area, by a single man armed with a whip of small cords, could take place by no mere human influence.

16. "Make not my Father's house an house of merchandise." These words are much less severe than those which He used at the last cleansing: "Ye have made it a den of thieves." Very likely in the interim the cheating and dishonesty which attended the unholy traffic had materially increased. It was only natural that it should.

17. "And his disciples remembered that it was written, 'The zeal of thine house hath eaten [or shall eat] me up.'" This is from Psalm lxix., which, among other things, that can be ascribed only

[1] Bishop Jeremy Taylor has some very apposite remarks, and one at least equally apposite illustration of them. "When religion is but the purpose at the second hand, it cannot hallow a lay design and make it fit to become a religious ministry, much less sanctify an unlawful action. . . . Micah was zealous when he made him an ephod and a teraphim, and meant to make himself an image for religion when he stole his mother's money; but there are colours of religion in which not only the world, but ourselves also, are deceived by a latent purpose, which we are willing to cover with a remote design of religion lest it should appear unhandsome in its own dressing . . . sinister acts of acquiring Church livings are not so soon condemned if the design be to prefer an able person. . . . This is profaning the temple with beasts brought for sacrifice," &c.

17 And his disciples remembered that it was written,
[m] Ps. lxix. 9. [m] The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up.

18 ¶ Then answered the Jews and said unto him, [n] What
[n] Matt. xii. 38. ch. vi. 30. sign shewest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest these things?

17. "The zeal of thine house;" or, "my zeal for thine house" (Alford).
"Hath eaten;" perhaps, "shall eat." So ℵ, A., B., L., and most Uncials.
18. "Then;" rather, "therefore," *ergo*.

to the Messiah, contains, "They gave me gall to eat, and when I was thirsty they gave me vinegar to drink." The latter part of this verse here quoted by the Evangelist, is also cited by St. Paul in Rom. xv. 3. Even Christ pleased not Himself, but as it is written, "The reproaches of them that reproached thee fell on me." No more wretchedly untrue perversion of Scripture has ever gained currency among Christian people, than that which has been so pertinaciously asserted by certain leading so-called "Broad Church" writers, that our Lord's attitude to the Law and the Old Testament was one of indifference. On the contrary, two of the three occasions on which He manifested extreme anger, was when He saw the Temple, the one centre of the sacrificial worship, polluted. [The other was when they forbade little children to be brought to Him.]

Are we not all taught a lesson by this, eminently necessary at the present time? If we can preserve a lofty and supercilious equanimity when we see God's house profaned, His worship, especially the highest worship of His Church, neglected or accounted as an inferior thing, and, above all, the gift of His co-equal and co-eternal Son treated as an open question, can we have any such zeal for the honour of His Father as burnt within Him?

This place also teaches us that the Spirit of Christ is not altogether a mild, gentle, quiet Spirit, after the manner of that mildness and gentleness which is engendered, not by the love of God, but by the love of ease, by fear of the faces of men, by indifference to the value of the truths of the Gospel.

18. "Then answered the Jews and said unto him, What sign shewest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest these things?" What made them ask for a sign, seeing that the thing which He had done was itself a sign? If an unknown man, alone and unaided, could overawe, and even deprive of their gains, a large number of un-

19 Jesus answered and said unto them, [o] Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.

20 Then said the Jews, Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days?

[o] Matt. xxvi. 61. & xxvii. 40. Mark xiv. 58. & xv. 29.

---

20. "Rear;" better, "raise." Keeping the same rendering of the same word, as in verse 19.

scrupulous and covetous men after the manner in which He had done, no other sign seems to have been needed. It was asking for a sign of a sign. But what they really meant was, "What proof dost Thou give that Thou exercisest such authority in the house of God (which is by His ordination under the chief priests) as to drive out those who sell victims for sacrifice by the express permission of those priests? What sign shewest Thou that Thou claimest to exercise an authority in the Temple above that of its governors?" Our Lord's answer was:—

19. "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." This, if we carefully consider it, was about the only answer which He could give. The act of authority in driving out the traffickers from the sacred precincts was a plain intimation that in the Theocracy He was higher than the chief priest. To have given an ordinary sign, such as healing a diseased person, would have been insufficient. It might be a sign why they should listen to Him, but not a sign that He had authority and right to take the law into His own hands as He had done. The authority He assumed was that of the only Son of the God of the Temple. He acted as a Son over His own house. The crowning proof of this was His Resurrection. By the Resurrection from the dead He would be declared to be the Son of God with power. On two other occasions He held out to them this sign, and this sign only:—

(1) "When ye have lifted up the Son of Man, then [by the Resurrection] ye shall know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself" [John viii. 28]: and (2) when the Pharisees desired a sign from heaven He said, "A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and there shall be no sign given it, but the sign of the prophet Jonah," *i.e.*, of His own Resurrection (Matth. xvi. 4).

The difficulty, of course, is, why did He tender this sign enigmatically, and not plainly? To which we answer: He may, by

21 But he spake [p] of the temple of his body.

22 When therefore he was risen from the dead, [q] his disciples remembered that he had said this unto them; and they believed the scripture, and the word which Jesus had said.

p Col. ii. 9. Heb. viii. 2. & 1 Cor. iii. 16. & vi. 19. 2 Cor. vi. 16.

q Luke xxiv. 8.

22. "Unto them" not in oldest MSS., ℵ, A., B., L., most Uncials, Vulg., and Peshito. He did not say the words to the disciples, but to the Jews.

some gesture, or by some word which has not been preserved, have plainly intimated to them, if they would have received the intimation, that He spake enigmatically or mysteriously; but they rejected such intimation, and perversely determined to take His words in the lowest and most literal sense that they could, as, in fact, they did on several other occasions—notably in those recorded in the third and sixth chapters of this Gospel. Throughout this Gospel our Lord speaks mysteriously—not parabolically, but mysteriously; and on no occasion did they reverently, or even seriously, endeavour to give Him credit for veiling some deep truth under such enigma. As it was, this saying sunk deep into the hearts of both enemies and friends. His enemies remembered it, and produced a perverted account of it at the trial before Caiaphas; His disciples, after His Resurrection, remembered it, and it confirmed their faith in Him, as witnessed to both by the Scripture, and by His own words.

21. "He spake of the temple of his body." His Body was the true temple of God. In It was the true and abiding Shechinah: the presence of the Word. "In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." In the rending of It upon the cross, the veil between God and man was rent, and now we have boldness to enter into the holiest through that Veil—viz., His Flesh. (Heb. x. 19.) And because His Body is the temple of God, so are ours. (1 Cor. iii. 16.)

22. "His disciples remembered that he had said this unto them." Christ was especially "manifested in remembrance." Passages in His life, and words on His lips, which at the time, in their state of half belief, seemed to the disciples obscure or common-place, started forth from the dark recesses of memory, and were transfigured, and shone out with a light which amazed them, that they had heard them, and had been so feebly affected by them

23 ¶ Now when he was in Jerusalem at the passover, in the feast *day*, many believed in his name, when they saw the miracles which he did.

24 But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all *men*,

---

23. "Feast day." "Day" should not be understood, as the feast lasted a week. "Miracles," "signs."

23. "Now when he was in Jerusalem at the passover, in the feast day, many believed in his name, when they saw the miracles [signs] which he did." It has been said that their faith was a false faith, because Jesus, Who saw their hearts, did not trust Himself to them. But we have no right to say this: for in the Scriptures, especially in this Gospel, every degree of faith is recognized as faith. If it exhibits its weakness and deficiency, it is not because the faith is deficient, *quâ* faith, but because the heart is shallow. Faith is the product of the Word of God, received into the heart. It may spring up, and afterwards wither, or be choked; but the springing up is real for the time, and it withers because it has no root, on account of the shallowness of the ground of the heart. Godet remarks: "This faith, in many, was not really of the essence of faith: it had for its object only the title (believed in His Name) of Christ." But, surely, when he wrote this he must have forgotten that those to whom He gave power to become the sons of God were those that "believe on His Name." (i. 12.) We shall have to notice continually throughout this Gospel this matter of *degrees* of faith: it is one of its most striking features that it exhibits men believing, and yet their belief coming short.

24. "Jesus did not commit himself." What does this mean? It cannot mean commit His person to them: for He was well aware that no man could lay hold on Him, because His hour was not yet come. It must mean, "did not speak to them, or teach them unreservedly." So Chrysostom: "He who dwells in men's hearts, and enters into their thoughts, took no heed of outward words; and knowing well that their warmth was but for a season, He placed not confidence in them as in perfect disciples, nor committed all His doctrine to them, as though they had already become firm believers."

25 And needed not that any should testify of man: for
c 1 Sam. xvi. 7. 1 Chron. xxviii. 9. Matt. ix. 4. Mark ii. 8. ch. vi. 64. & xvi. 30. Acts i. 24. Rev. ii. 23.
r he knew what was in man.

25. "He knew;" rather, "He himself knew;" *ipse sciebat* (Vulg.).

His not committing Himself to them may be best understood by contrasting His conduct to them with that to His Apostles, to whom He says, "I have called you friends, for all things that I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you." (xv. 15.)

CHAP. III.

THERE was a man of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews:

1. "There was a man of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews." Are we to connect this discourse with Nicodemus with the declaration in the last chapter, that "many believed in His Name when they saw the miracles which He did," and so have we here the example of one to whom, being more sincere than the greater part, the Lord so far "committed Himself" as to disclose to him one of the deepest mysteries of His kingdom? There may be some truth in this, but the exhibition of the development of mere subjective belief is very subordinate to the exhibition of those mysteries which have seemed to the Church to be the real burden of this Gospel. Jesus was continually revealing truths respecting Himself and His kingdom which could not be understood at that time, even by those who accepted Him as the Messiah. In fact, they were the last things which, owing to their mysteriousness, could be taught to the very Church itself, and so it was reserved to the Beloved Disciple, in extreme old age, after the Kingdom or Church of God had been established for nearly seventy years to put on record certain discourses of Christ, the teaching of which had leavened the Apostles, and, through them, the Church, secretly

2 [a]The same came to Jesus by night, and said unto him, Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God: for [b]no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except [c]God be with him.

3 Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily,

[a] ch. vii. 50. & xix. 39.
[b] ch. ix. 16, 33. Acts ii. 22.
[c] Acts x. 38.

---

2. "Miracles." Properly, "signs," σημεῖα; Vulg., *signa*.

and silently, long before the Holy Spirit guided the Evangelist to put them into writing. The Church for many years had been permeated with Baptismal and Eucharistic doctrine; for instance, St. Paul's leading doctrine is that the Church is the Body of Christ, and that Christians are now in Christ as they were by nature in Adam, and now at last St. John is led to give the root of it all in the words of Christ, recorded in the third, sixth, and fifteenth chapters of this Gospel.

Of Nicodemus nothing is known except what is told us in the three notices of him in this Gospel (iii. 1, vii. 50, xix. 39). A rich man of his name is mentioned in Jewish tradition as living in our Lord's time, and surviving the destruction of Jerusalem. He comes here before us as a believer in some Divine Mission of Jesus, but afraid to come to Him in the broad light of day. He expresses his faith in the words, "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him."

3. "Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." The answer of Christ is very abrupt. Whether there had been more words of inquiry on the part of Nicodemus, or whether our Lord read and answered his thoughts, we know not. In either case his thoughts, or his unrecorded words, must have been respecting "the kingdom of God." If Nicodemus came to our Lord as a God-sent prophet for instruction, it must have been to learn what he could not know from the Old Testament, or from the Jewish traditionary teaching. He could scarcely have come to Christ with some personal inquiry as to how he was to serve or please God, or to inherit eternal life, as the young ruler did (Matt. xix. 17), or he would have received some similar answer. He could only have come to inquire respecting the new Kingdom; and our Lord's answer, though more circumstantial, is, in effect, that which He

verily, I say unto thee, [d] Except a man be born

[d] ch. i. 13. Gal. vi. 15. Tit. iii. 5. James i. 18. 1 Pet. i. 23. 1 John iii. 9.

3. "Born again," or, "from above," but see below. Vulg., *denuo*.

gave when questioned by Pilate, "My kingdom is not of this world," "Now is my kingdom not from hence."

It will be needful to dwell more upon this, as it is the key to the understanding of the whole matter.

Did our Lord mean by the words, "Except a man be born again," followed, in the way of explanation, by "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit," to press upon Nicodemus, as a worldly, carnal man, the necessity of repentance or conversion, or of a new heart? It is impossible to suppose that He did, because, if so, why should He not express Himself plainly, so that Nicodemus could have at once had no doubt about the matter? Our Lord, at other times, called men to repentance and conversion in words respecting the meaning of which no one could have a moment's hesitation. Neither can we suppose that our Lord meant to bring to bear upon Nicodemus the necessity of deeper spiritual religion; for we have such heart religion, expressed in terms devoid of all mystery, in the Beatitudes, and our Lord speaks here enigmatically and mysteriously.

Again, He speaks of that of which He sets forth the necessity, as a "birth." Now, what is a birth? It is not a change of heart, or of character. It is the entrance into a new state of existence. Generation is coming out of non-existence into existence. Birth is also the entrance into a state of life as different as possible from that in the womb. A new birth would be into a new life requiring an outward state of things corresponding to that life, for the creature which is born possesses its own particular sort of life, and by birth enters into a state fitted for the sustentation and development of that life. Again, this new birth is represented as universally necessary, "Except any one (τις) be born of water and of the Spirit." This is more than the calling of those who have sinned to repentance. It is not a necessity which follows upon some sinful course, but a necessity for all human nature.

Now all this leads us up to the doctrine of the Catholic Church in all its branches, respecting these words of our Lord, which is, that they set forth the new birth, as an entrance into a new spiritual state corresponding to the old, or first birth into a state of sin and evil.

again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.

With this comparison or contrast, the Baptismal Service of the English Branch of the Catholic Church opens: "Forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin, and that our Saviour Christ saith 'none can enter into the kingdom of God except he be regenerate and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost,' I beseech you to call upon God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of His bounteous mercy He will grant to this child that thing which by nature he cannot have, that he may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's holy Church, and be made a lively member of the same." All explanations of the words of Christ which I have seen, which were written before the sixteenth century, are substantially the same as this. It also expresses what all the Fathers of the Church, from Justin and Irenæus downwards, have said upon these words of Christ.

That the Church has seized upon the truth of our Lord's words is evident from the testimony of all the rest of the New Testament.

The great teacher of the Church, St. Paul, has no words throughout his Epistles exactly reproducing or quoting our Lord's words. In only one place does he describe the entrance into the Christian state as a birth, and that is in Titus iii. 5, "By His mercy He saved us by the font [or bath] of New Birth, and renewing of the Holy Ghost," but it cannot be supposed for a moment that an Apostle to whom God committed the writing of so much of the Christian scriptures, and the bringing of such multitudes of Gentiles into the kingdom of God, should have nothing in his writings corresponding to his Master's words.

Now the words of St. Paul respecting entrance into the Kingdom or Church of God, answering to these words of Christ, are: "So many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His Death. Therefore we are buried with Him by Baptism into [His] death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." (Rom. vi. 3, 4.) Again, "Buried with him in Baptism, wherein also ye are risen [or were raised] with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." (Col. ii. 12.) Again, "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." (1 Cor. xii. 13.) Again, "Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the

4 Nicodemus saith unto him, How can a man be born

Word." (Ephes. v. 26.) Again, "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus: for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." (Gal. iii. 26, 27.) Again, "By his mercy he saved us by the washing [bath or font] of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." (Titus iii. 5.)

The greatest Christian privilege in the eyes of this Apostle is to be "in Christ." In Christ mystically and spiritually, as we are in Adam naturally and carnally. The leading expression of St. Paul's practical teaching is being "in Christ." He urges men to have every Christian disposition, he would have men perform every Christian duty, as members of Christ.

Does then our Lord, when He says, "Except a man be born again of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," mean that every human being to whom His kingdom is preached must die to sin and be raised again to newness of life in holy Baptism, must by Baptism put on Christ, must by one Spirit be baptized into one body, must be cleansed with the washing of water by the Word, must be brought into Christ, and continue in Him, spiritually, as he is in, and continues in, Adam naturally? Yes, it must be so, if St. Paul is an inspired teacher who carries on the teaching of our Lord; for our Lord, by the words He uses, evidently describes the entrance into the state of things, the kingdom or Divine Fellowship which He came into the world to establish, and St. Paul, in the words *he* was led by the Spirit to use, describes the entrance into, and the continuance in the same state. There cannot be two Christian states or kingdoms, one described by our Lord, the other by His inspired servant. The servant must describe the same kingdom and the same entrance into it as the Master does.

Does our Lord then, by being "born again" "of water and of the Spirit," mean that a man must be baptized, and nothing more? No, He means that a man must enter into a new state of things, having throughout the closest relation to Himself and to His Spirit, but that this entrance is, for reasons known only to Himself, so connected with Baptism, that a baptized man must be held to have entered into it, and an unbaptized man, no matter how spiritual, must receive Baptism, or he cannot be accounted to be in it: and besides this, inasmuch as a man is born in order that he may live

when he is old? can he enter the second time into his

---

and grow up in the state into which he is born, our Lord must have in His mind, not a mere momentary entrance, but an abiding in the state into which the man has entered. We must take His words here in connection with His words in John xv. that He is the true Vine, His people are the branches who have to abide in Him; if they abide in Him they bear fruit; if they abide not in Him they are fruitless, and they are, or will be, cut off.

Our Lord's words, then, cannot be taken by themselves; much less can we measure their meaning by the knowledge or ignorance, faith or unbelief, which Nicodemus had, or is supposed to have had.

They were spoken at the very outset of our Lord's ministry, but like many others, perhaps like all His words, they were seeds which were deposited through the Apostles in the mind of the Church, and sprung up and were developed into the doctrine of the apostolic age, which doctrine was necessarily taught to every one baptized or grafted into the Church; but, apparently, not in our Lord's words as recorded in this chapter, but in kindred words, which preserved the original feature of our Lord's utterance in that they made water and the Spirit co-factors in the production of the New Birth.

The principle contained in them is this:—

The Son of God came amongst us, not as a spirit, but in the flesh. He came to renew a race which was in the flesh, and had received evil not spiritually, as from teaching, or from following an example, but through their flesh; through the human nature each one had received at his birth. He came to regenerate our whole nature and all that belongs to us. He came to redeem not only our souls, but our bodies also: He came to redeem our relationships, our society, our intercourse both with God and our fellow-creatures. He came amongst us not only as a Teacher, or as a propitiatory Sacrifice, or as a private Friend to each person who individually accepts Him, but as the Head of a new family or race—a mystical Head—an Adam.

To this end He instituted a new order of things which, though not of this world, was to be in it; a heavenly kingdom or fellowship, yet a kingdom existing upon earth, discernible amongst the things of time and sense. This new state of things is His Church. It is the Vine of which He is the stem, the Body of which He is the Head. But if it is to be one of such things it must be organized, it

mother's womb, and be born?

---

must be visible, and yet every branch or member of it must have a secret and vital union with the Stem or Head.

This new kingdom was on the day of Pentecost organized under Apostolic rule, so that its organization is a part of its essence. Men are admitted into this Church, not by a mere rite or ceremony, but by a Sacrament, which not merely *betokens* certain truths, but *incorporates* human beings into a supernatural kingdom, and they are continued in this fellowship by another Sacrament, which not merely teaches them, but feeds them with such Supernatural Nourishment that if they are faithful the Divine Head is in them and they in Him. To this mystical Body belongs the promise of the Spirit, Who is pledged to accompany the Sacraments, the preaching, the rule, the ordinations of its officers. All the members of this body, unless they have fallen away, or have been cut off, are in Christ; in a way corresponding to that in which they are naturally in Adam, so that no matter how some parts have declined, the whole has still a supernatural Root, a supernatural Head, and it has means by which each member is grafted into, or continued in, the holy fellowship. These its supernatural properties and functions are not to wear out with time, but by the exercise of faith are capable of perpetual renewal or revival.

Now it is clear that it is but fitting to call the entrance into this state of things a new birth, and it is clear also that in the bringing about of this birth there must be more than a mere human agency, there must be in each particular birth a Divine act of the Spirit, just as in the bringing of each particular human soul into this world, seeing that it is destined for the service of God here, and immortality hereafter, there must be a very special putting forth of God's will and power. If we look at things in their right light we must acknowledge that the lowest gift or grace of the mystical Body is from above, and like all the things of Christ is shown to us, and made over to us, by the Spirit.

It may be asked, then, What is the place of the water? We answer, it is that which the Church brings, and through her ministers applies in the name of the Trinity, and which the person baptized receives in token that he desires to enter into the heavenly kingdom; or which he receives because those who have the charge of him desire that he may be received into, and brought up under,

5 Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, [e] Except a man be born of water and *of* the Spirit, he

[e] Mark xvi. 16. Acts ii. 38.

the grace and laws of the kingdom. Thus St. Augustine, in commenting on this passage, speaks of the first, or natural birth, as from Adam and Eve, the second from God and the Church; because the agent or minister of the Church performs the Church's part, examines as to the state of heart, puts the questions, receives the confession of repentance and faith, and applies the element in the name of the Trinity.

The realization of all this, the reader will see at a glance, depends upon our belief in the fact that Christ came, not only to atone for sin, but to set up a kingdom, a Church, which is His Body. If we in our hearts think that the Church is a human institution, or that the promise of Christ has failed, so that though originally Divine, it is human now; if we believe that its sacraments are merely decent edifying ceremonies, and that its ministry is the creature of needs or circumstances, and so on; then, of course, it seems a misuse of sacred words to call entrance into such a state a new birth, much less to call it a birth of the Spirit; but if we realize that, notwithstanding all declensions, deficiences, divisions, superstitions, and debasements in its present state, the Lord has yet left upon the earth a Divine institution, or society, or kingdom, having through its ministry and sacraments a constant hold on, and connection with, Himself; in short, if we believe what St. Paul wrote when he spoke of "the Head from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God," if I say, we believe this, then we shall believe that a birth from above, a new birth of water and the Spirit, is the fitting word to describe the entrance into it.

And the converse is mournfully true, that if the Church is worldly and unspiritual, and untrue to her Divine origin, if she presents the appearance of a secular rather than of a Divine institution, then men cannot believe that there can be any need of a Divine Birth into her, and they will cast about for a meaning for these words of our Lord which virtually ignores His own reference to the outward element, and also for the words of His Apostles which evidently continue His own teaching respecting the place of Sacraments in His system.

Is, then, the new birth an entrance into a state only? No, it is

cannot enter into the kingdom of God.

---

the gift of a new life, because it is grafting a human being into the new Tree of human nature. A man by being born or grafted into the Church is joined to the Head, and begins to partake of a new life from Him. And so Regeneration has been well described as being "the correlative and opposite of original sin. As original sin is the transmission of a quality of evil, so regeneration is the infusion of a quality of good; as original sin is inherited without the personal act of us who are born of the flesh, so regeneration is bestowed without personal merit in us who are born of the Spirit."

Is there, then, no natural good in those who are not regenerate? Certainly there is, but God desires to change it into, or substitute for it, a higher good, even goodness from the Second Adam. This goodness is the highest that a human being can attain to: if it remains in any one it will expel all sin, according to the words of the Apostle, "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; *for his seed remaineth in him*," and it will bear the fruit most pleasing of all to God, according to the words of our Lord in this same Gospel, "He that abideth in Me and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit." (John xv. 5.)

Regeneration, then, is at once the seed or beginning of a new life, and the entrance into a state of things designed by God (if faithfully used) to sustain and develop that new life.

It necessarily follows upon all that we have said, that Regeneration, or the new Birth of Water and the Spirit, is a new thing, the speciality of the New Covenant as contrasted with the Old. It could not be till the Lord from heaven had taken our flesh and blood, and had come amongst us as the Second Adam, and had risen again in a body capable of communicating to us the new life of the Second Adam. This is the reason why we have not the smallest hint of a new birth in the Old Testament. Repentance and spiritual religion and intercourse with God, are set forth so fully in the Book of Psalms that it is the Manual of Christians on these subjects; but Regeneration is not once mentioned. They, then, utterly mistake the case who think that in these words about the New Birth our Lord had in view the character of Nicodemus, as impenitent, or Pharisaical, or worldly. If instead of Nicodemus, Abraham himself had similarly come to the Lord, He would have set before him the same necessity.

For those who wish to see this great subject further treated,

6 That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.

---

especially with reference to Infant Baptism, I have appended an excursus at the end of the commentary on this Gospel.

6. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh: and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." This place is made more difficult by understanding the "flesh" here as the element of sin, as if the Lord meant, "That which is born of sinful flesh is sinful, and that which is born of the Spirit is holy." But such an explanation does not correspond to His words, which seem rather to teach that a being in some lower scale of existence cannot generate or reproduce that which is in a higher state. Flesh, even though sinless, can only generate flesh. The Jewish, or old state of things was "of the flesh," it was the natural and national fellowship of those who came from the loins of Abraham; but a new state of things was to supervene, which, like Him Who was its root, was to be from heaven. Just, then, as flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, so that which is merely born of flesh and blood can neither enter into it or discern its mysteries. Something must supervene which is of a higher order than the flesh and its reproductive powers. This is the Spirit, and His reproduction of the New Adam in the children of the Church. If anything is thus generated it is of a higher order, it is spiritual, and can both discern mysteries and live a life which, under the Old Testament, was impossible.[1]

---

[1] The word Spirit in the subject denotes the Divine Spirit, and in the predicate the new man. Here again the substantive (Spirit) is employed in the predicate instead of the adjective (spiritual) to describe the new essence. The word Spirit embraces in the context not only the new principle of spiritual life, but also the spiritualized soul and body. The neuter *τὸ γεγεννημένον*, *that which is born*, is substituted in both propositions for the masculine, "he who is born," to denote the nature of the product abstractedly from the individual, thus bringing more into relief the universality of the law. Hilgenfeld here finds the Gnostic distinction between two kinds of men. Meyer well answers, there is a distinction, not between two classes of men, but between two phases of the same individual life. (Godet.)

7 Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born
‖ Or, *from above.* || again.

8 [f] The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou
[f] Eccles. xi. 5. 1 Cor. ii. 11.
hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit.

9 Nicodemus answered and said unto him, [g] How can
[g] ch. vi. 52, 60.
these things be?

7. "Again," or "from above," as in verse 3.

7. "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again." This seems directed to doubts working in the mind of Nicodemus, not to any further words expressing wonder.

8. "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit" This place seems difficult because we think we can always tell from what quarter and in what direction the wind bloweth. So Augustine translates the word "wind" by Spirit, meaning the Spirit of God, as if the Lord implied that every one that is born of the Spirit, is actuated by a secret will above the world, and moves with a mysterious freedom unknown to the world, as the Spirit does. But it can scarcely be said of the Holy Spirit that He bloweth, and that His "sound is heard." Again, it has been explained as if our Lord alluded, not to the violent rushing wind, but to a gentle gale sighing in a wood or forest, which springs up we know not where, rustles gently the leaves, and then as suddenly and imperceptibly dies away. Chrysostom seems to give the true idea when he remarks: "Here is the conclusion of the whole matter: if," saith he, "thou knowest not how to explain the motion nor the path of this wind which thou perceivest by hearing and touching, why art thou over-anxious about the working of the Divine Spirit, when thou understandest not that of the wind, though thou hearest its voice?" The expression "bloweth where it listeth" is also used to establish the power of the Comforter, for if none can hold the wind, but it moveth where it listeth, much less will the laws of nature, or limits of bodily generation, or anything of the like kind, be able to restrain the operations of the Spirit.

9. "Nicodemus answered and said unto him, How can these things

10 Jesus answered and said unto him, Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things?

---

10. "A master." Literally, "the master;" but such a translation is inadmissible, as, according to the English use of the article, it would mean that he was the only teacher, or, at least, the chief teacher, which we have no reason to believe that he was.

be?" How can there be a kingdom, invisible in its origin and end, and yet making itself sensibly felt in the visible world of human society? Nicodemus, as a Jew, would only understand a visible and sensible kingdom of God like the Jewish Theocracy. He had yet to learn that there could be a kingdom of God free, and yet under the rule of God, invisible in its privileges and the inward grace of its Sacraments, and yet sensible, having, like the wind, at times an irresistible power; and each single member, like the kingdom itself, begotten invisibly of God, even though the Sacrament of begetting be an outward sign; free, and yet the servant of God; having (if he abides in it) a life hid with Christ in God, and having meat to eat that the world knows not of.

10. "Jesus saith unto him, Art thou a master [lit., the teacher] of Israel, and knoweth not these things?" Our Lord, it seems, does not so much blame his want of knowledge as his slowness of spiritual perception, his failing to recognize the truth which much in the Old Testament would have prepared him for. He could scarcely have been expected to recognize a new birth from his mere knowledge of the Old Testament, as such a thing is not once mentioned there; but when the need of that new birth was presented to him, probably in many more words than are here recorded, he should have been ready, if a sincere teacher of the people of God, to apprehend and welcome it. There was much in the Old Testament to lead a sincere inquirer to expect an altogether new and different state of things in the kingdom of the Messiah. There was the prophecy (Jerem. xxxi. 31, 34, that God would write His laws in men's hearts; that He would sprinkle clean water upon them and they should be clean (Ezek. xxxvi. 25); that He would make all things new (Isa. lxv. 17). The latter portion of the 22nd Psalm and of the 53rd of Isaiah, the 72nd Psalm, and many prophecies of Ezekiel and other prophets seem to set forth a state of things which would most fittingly be called a Regeneration. It may be also that Nicodemus, gathering from the Old Testament the transmission of sin through natural generation from Adam, ought, if he looked for a

11 [h] Verily, verily, I say unto thee, We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen; and [i] ye receive not our witness.

[h] Matt xi 27. ch. i. 18. & viii. 16. & viii. 28. & xii. 49. & xiv. 24.
[i] ver. 32.

12 If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you *of* heavenly things?

---

thoroughly remedial dispensation, to have been ready to welcome a new birth unto righteousness in a new Head of mankind, according to an old Jewish proverb, "The mystery of Adam is the mystery of the Messiah."

11. "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen; and ye receive not our witness." The change from the "I," the first person singular, to the "we" is remarkable. Whom does the Lord associate with Himself as speaking that which *we* know? It has been explained of the disciples, but this is impossible, for long after this they could not believe that He would die as a sacrifice for sin. Their knowledge of the real nature of the Messianic kingdom, as appears from the request of James and John, was as low and rudimentary as that of Nicodemus. Some explain it of the Trinity, the witness of the Father and the Son through the Spirit. Taking into account such a place as John xv. 15, I cannot think that the Lord here alludes to any witness of man as co-ordinate with His own, with reference to the new birth into His kingdom. He assuredly here speaks from the Divine standpoint. We know, We have seen, We yet see all the secrets of this lower nature – heaven, earth, and hell are naked and open before us. We know all the needs of the nature we have assumed. We speak these things with the power and assurance of those who have seen what they disclose.[1]

"Ye receive not our witness." Spoken of the Jews generally, akin to "How often would I have gathered thy children, and ye would not." "Ye will not come to me that ye might have life."

12. "If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not," &c.

---

[1] Alford, apparently after Chrysostom, supposes that our Lord adopts a quasi-proverbial saying, "I am one of those who speak that they know," &c., somewhat akin to our saying, "Seeing is believing."

13 And [k] no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, *even* the Son of man which is in heaven.

[k] Prov. xxx. 4. ch. vi. 33, 38, 51, 62. & xvi. 28. Acts ii. 34. 1 Cor. xv. 47. Eph. iv. 9, 10.

13. "Which is in heaven." These very important words are omitted by the MSS. of the Neutral Text, and by those only; *i.e.* they are omitted by ℵ, B., L., and amongst Cursives by 33 only. The clause is contained in A., E., G., H., K., M., and others; in all Cursives except 33. Scrivener writes: "There is really no Patristic evidence to set up against it, for it matters nothing that Eusebius might have cited the words twice and did not; that Cyril of Alexandria, who alleges them once, passed them over once; that Origen also (in the Latin translation) neglected them once, inasmuch as he quotes them twice, once very expressly. Hippolytus is the prime witness in their favour, for he draws a theological inference from the passage, wherein he is followed in two places by Hilary and by Epiphanius." Amongst editors Tregelles retains them; Tischendorf, after rejecting, on better thoughts restored them to his text in his eighth edition; Westcott and Hort reject them.

The Lord had been speaking to Nicodemus of Regeneration, which, though of heavenly origin, has its subject and its sphere here on earth, and may be illustrated by the analogies of many earthly things, such as birth and the course of the wind; and so it is, comparatively, an earthly thing; whereas it is a part of the Lord's commission to reveal things purely heavenly, such as the oneness of Himself and the Father, Their co-working, Their mutual knowledge, the Spirit speaking of that which He hears, and such "things of God." No earthly analogy will help men to believe these things of highest heaven. They must be taken at the word of Him Who came down from heaven, Who is in heaven.

13. "No man hath ascended up to heaven." Godet remarks: "The general meaning of this profound saying is as follows: No one hath ascended to heaven so as to be able to tell you of it from what he has seen, except Him Who has come down from it to live with you as a man, and Who even here below remains there always."

But is this sufficient? Christ's revelation is not of heaven, *i.e.* of the angelic sphere, but it is rather of Him Who manifests His presence in heaven, and of His relations to His Son, and of the Spirit Who proceeds from Him. We must understand, then, by "no man hath ascended up to heaven," "no man hath been with God," "no man hath been in the bosom of the Father, but He that came down, not from some lower place in heaven, but out from God," He Who "came forth from the Father, and is come into the world."

"The Son of man which is in heaven." In this place He called

14 ¶ [l]And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilder-
[l] Num. xxi. 9.
[m] ch viii. 28.
& xii. 32.
ness, even so [m]must the Son of man be lifted up:

not the flesh "Son of man," but He now named, so to speak, His entire Self from the inferior substance; indeed, this is His wont to call His whole person often from His Divinity, and often from His Humanity. (Chrysostom.)

"It may therefore be said that our Lord led two lives in parallel lines, an earthly and a heavenly life. He lived continually in His Father; this was His heavenly life. And while living thus in the Father, He gave Himself unceasingly to men in a life which was truly human." (Godet.)

The words "which is in heaven" are omitted by the Vatican Codex and others of the Neutral Text, ℵ and L., but unless we assign to the Neutral Text an overwhelming weight, counterbalancing all other authorities, they must be retained. They are difficult words, and so are much more likely to have been omitted than to have been inserted. (See extract from Scrivener's Introduction in "Critical Notes.")

14. "And as Moses lifted up the serpent . . . lifted up." These words seem to come in very abruptly, and we cannot help thinking that much which our Lord said has not been recorded. If, however, they follow upon verse 13, the connection may be somewhat of this sort. He had asserted in verse 13 that He had come down from heaven, and had implied that He would ascend up thither again; but they must not think that He would bring about the new birth and other things pertaining to salvation simply by His exaltation: He would rather accomplish salvation by utter humiliation. Before He was lifted up to the throne of God, He must be "lifted up" in shame and pain and weakness upon the cross; and the eye of faith must behold Him as on the cross before it can effectually behold Him in glory.

"Seest thou," says Chrysostom, "the cause of the Crucifixion, and the salvation which is by it? Seest thou the relationship of the type to the reality? there the Jews escaped death, but the temporal, here believers the eternal; there the brazen serpent heals the bites of serpents, here the crucified Jesus cured the wounds inflicted by the spiritual dragon; there he who looked with his bodily eyes was healed, here he who beholds with the eyes of the understanding puts

15 That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but [n] have eternal life.

16 ¶ [o] For God so loved the world, that he

[n] ver. 36. ch. vi. 47.

[o] Rom. v. 8. 1 John iv. 9.

---

15. "Should not perish, but" omitted by ℵ, B., L., seven or eight Cursives, Cureton Syriac, &c.: retained by A., most later Uncials, almost all Cursives, old Latin (most), Vulg., Peshito, &c.

off all his sins; there that which was hung was brass fashioned into the likeness of a serpent, here it was the Lord's Body [fashioned] by the Spirit; there a serpent bit and a serpent healed, here death destroyed and a Death saved."

15. "Whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." Whoso by an act of faith apprehends Him, and fixes the inward gaze of his soul upon Him, as the very Son of the Most High crucified for him, but crucified so that no man should continue in sin, but be delivered from its power—whoso looks to Him for deliverance from the sin itself as well as from its penalty, shall have everlasting life, life both of body and spirit—his whole man delivered from the consequences of sin, and made partaker of the Life of Him to Whom he looks. The serpent of brass was appointed to set forth the Divine Antitype. As the serpent was made in the likeness of the destroying thing, so Christ, when crucified, seemed one in whom sin culminated, and so was suffering its severest penalty. The serpent was lifted up to be seen by all Israelites, so Christ is now lifted up in the Church, in the preaching of the Gospel, and in the celebration of the Eucharist, that all may see Him with the eye of faith.

If anyone thinks that this and similar types savour somewhat of childishness, let him remember that the vast mass of mankind whose lives are consumed in working for daily bread, are in a state of mental childhood, and will always be so; and the Gospel is for such—for the simple and poor—and nothing so comes home to such as these and sets the truth before them so clearly, as do types and figures.

16. "For God so loved the world," &c. A doubt has been raised as to whether these words are the words of the Lord, or of the Evangelist reflecting upon what has been said in verse 15, and so carrying on the thought. They seem at first sight to be the words of Christ, but the speaker of them seems to regard the work of salvation as initiated by the Father and accomplished by the Son, more

gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

---

from an external standpoint than is usual in the discourses of Christ. We should rather have expected Him to say, "My Father so loved," &c., "The Father sent Me into the world," &c. But no matter whose words they are, they belong to the highest sphere of inspiration. The Church has placed them amongst the "comfortable words" to prepare her children for the reception of the Eucharist.

The measure of the love of God is the sending of His Son in the way of the Incarnation, so that He should die upon the Cross in the Body which He had assumed. When He saith that He "gave" His only begotten Son, it is meant that He gave—not a servant, not an angel, not an archangel—but His very Son. If He be not, like any other true son, of the essence of His Father, then as St. Cyril writes, the wide-spread marvel of the love of God will at length come to nought, for He gave a creature, and not one truly His Son.

This is one of the chief household words of our religion. Let the reader notice how it utterly destroys the notion of a colourless, an undoctrinal, undogmatic Christianity; for in this simplest enunciation of the redeeming Love of God, we have four or five doctrines or dogmas, all, in their time, subjects of fierce controversy. We have the fact that in the unity of the Divine Nature there is a true and proper Father, and a true and proper Son. We have the fact that God gave this Son to take our nature, in order that in that nature He might die to atone for our sins. This is the Incarnation and the Atonement. We have the fact that He is apprehended by faith, and we are saved by faith, *i.e.* justification by faith, and that His Redempton is not of a few, but of the world—in other words, that Redemption is universal and not particular—of the world, not of the elect.

Every word in this verse has a world of meaning.

"God *gave* His Son." The word "gave" contains infinitely more than the idea of sending. It expresses entire surrender—the gift carried, if needs be, to the utmost limits of sacrifice, so that not only should the Sacrifice be offered in death, but that the Sacrificial Body should be partaken of, as the Lord says, "My Father giveth you the true bread from heaven," and as the Church says in a part of her Eucharistic office, "God gave His Son, *not only* to die

17 For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved.

18 He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned

a ch. v. 45. & viii. 15. & xii. 47. 1 John iv. 14.

b ch. v. 24. & xx. 31.

---

18. The words "because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God" are omitted in the Revision of 1881. See below.

for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance in that Holy Sacrament."

Whosoever believeth—no matter what his past sin, no matter what the number of former falls, no matter how deep his former alienation—should not perish, should not perish for his sins, or in them.

"But have everlasting life." Have the Life of the Incarnate Son, Body, Soul, and Spirit, in his body, soul, and spirit, according to His words. "I am the Resurrection and the Life," and according to His other words, "Whoso eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath Eternal Life, and I will raise him up at the last day."

17. "God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world," &c. When God sent perfect Holiness and Goodness into the world in the Person of His Son, it might have been thought that it was for its condemnation, by exhibiting the contrast between God's goodness and man's evil, and so showing them how unapproachable the goodness of God was: but so far from this, He sent His Son that His goodness might become theirs, and be infused into them, so that they might be "saved by His Life." (Rom. v. 10).

18. "He that believeth on Him is not condemned," &c. This presupposes that the believer is brought into Christ and abides in Him. (John xv. 1-10.) The true belief in Christ is a belief which apprehends Him because it sees in Him the remedy for the most deep-seated moral evils. Belief in the Son of God is belief in Him, for the purposes for which God has given Him. It implies coming to Him (John vi. 35) for His Life, i.e. His power within to subdue sin and evil, and for righteousness and goodness. Such an one is not condemned: the atonement, the grace, the perpetual advocacy of Christ is his, even though, through the "frailty of his nature, he cannot always stand upright."

already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.

"He that believeth not is condemned already," &c. . . . "only begotten Son of God." This must be taken with the next verse, "This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil."

Unbelief in Christ as the Remedy for Sin, the Light of the Conscience, and the Revealer of God, is its own condemnation, not its own judgment, but its own judgment against itself, *i.e.*, its condemnation. A doer of deeds of darkness prefers darkness to light (Job xxiv. 15); the darkness is his element; but this very fact is his condemnation, because it shows how unnatural the state of his heart and conduct is, and so unbelief in Christ, is, in this respect, worse than sin. It is the sinful heart so loving what is evil, that it rejects the Remedy for sin, so fearing a healthy and discerning conscience that it refuses to have it enlightened, so loving the things of sense that it refuses to entertain the highest thoughts of God: for these things, the Remedy for sin, the rectified conscience, the highest views of God, it gets in and through Christ.

And now it will be necessary to call attention to an alteration in the translation of these verses which is adopted by the Revisers of 1881, and by many modern commentators, which I cannot help regarding (and I shall give reasons) as most mischievous, and this is the substitution of the words "judge" and "judgment" for the words "condemn" and "condemnation," of the version of 1611. They have rendered it, "God sent not the Son into the world to judge the world, but that the world should be saved through Him. He that believeth on Him is not judged, he that believeth not is judged already," &c. "In the case of the believer," we read in the "Speaker's Commentary," "there is no judgment: his whole life is in Christ." But if the believer be in Christ, he is a branch of the true Vine, and so far from not being under judgment, he is under a higher and more searching one, for he is under the judging eye of the Husbandman of Whom it is said, "Every branch in Me that beareth not fruit He taketh away." Our Lord in the parable of the Pounds and of the Talents must contemplate believers, and, surely, it must be according to a judgment that one

19 And this is the condemnation, [r] that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil.

[r] ch. i. 4, 9, 10, 11, & viii. 12.

---

19. "That light;" rather, "The Light," the personal Light, the Lord Jesus. So also "the darkness."

man is given to rule over ten cities, another over five. St. Paul, in 1 Corinth. iii., in speaking of those who must certainly be accounted believers, for they build on the one foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble, speaks of them as awaiting a very fiery judgment indeed. If the believer is not judged, he stands apart from the moral government of God, which is impossible. God can no more cease to be a man's Judge than He can cease to be his God. If any intelligent beings are not judged by God, it must be because God is absolutely indifferent to their actions as good or evil. It is not salvation and judgment which are opposed, but salvation and condemnation. He that believeth not, is not merely judged already, but he is condemned already, for the judgment at once results in condemnation. He is condemned already, and, on the other hand, the Judge exercises His office as much in acquitting or pardoning or rewarding, as He does in condemning or punishing. God is as much the Judge when He renders to "those who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory, honour, and immortality, eternal life," as when He renders "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul that doeth evil."

The word *krisis*, like our corresponding English word "judgment," sometimes means the act of judging, sometimes the issue of that judgment, in condemnation or even punishment. The context in this, as in every case, enables us to decide with certainty; and here both the 16th and 18th verses contain parallel assertions. In the 16th, perishing, which must be condemnation, is parallel to everlasting life; in the 18th, 'not being condemned' is parallel to the not merely 'being judged,' but being 'condemned already,' and in the 19th, the condemnation cannot be merely judgment, but must be judgment culminating in condemnation.

The universal judgment of God as affecting believers and unbelievers, just and unjust, saints and angels, is set forth so categorically, and so frequently and solemnly, that it behoves us to see that we give not the smallest encouragement to any man to imagine

20 For [a] every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be || reproved.

21 But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God.

[a] Job xxiv. 13, 17. Eph. v. 13.

‖ Or, *discovered.*

that present faith, or present warm feelings, or present assurances, raise him above anxious care as to whether he shall stand in that day. The number of religious, or seemingly religious persons, who because they think they have been saved, scorn all mention or all thought of judgment, is enormous. The number of persons who because they have been converted or saved, or have believed, openly profess that they cannot commit sin—that what is sin in others is not sin in them—the number of such persons, I say, would, I doubt not, surprise the scholars who held up their hands for this uncalled-for and mischievous alteration.

20. "Every one that doeth evil hateth the light." Chrysostom notices that it is not every one that hath done evil in time past, but every one that *now* doeth evil; every one that continues wilfully in sin hateth the light, as it destroys all his false peace by revealing to him the sinfulness of that sin.

21. "He that doeth truth cometh to the light." The expression is to be noticed. It is not "he that doeth good," neither is it "he that believeth in the truth." It seems to mean that all real goodness and virtue is according to the highest truth, the truth of God's own Nature. He that doeth good, does that which makes manifest the goodness and righteousness of God. St. Augustine has a remarkable passage, showing that repentance and confession of sin is the first doing of truth. "What meaneth 'thou doest truth?' Thou dost not fondle thyself, not soothe, not flatter thyself . . . but thou comest to the light, that thy works may be made manifest that they be wrought in God. Because this very thing, namely, the displeasure thou hast at thy sin, thou wouldest not have at all, did not God shine into thee, and His Truth show thee thy sin."

The man cometh to the light that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God, not in himself, that all the glory of them is God's. Not that he is distinctly conscious of this intention: on the contrary, he comes to the light that his deeds

22 ¶ After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judæa; and there he tarried with them, [t]and baptized.

[t] ch. iv. 2.

23 ¶ And John also was baptizing in Ænon near to [u]Salim, because there was much water there; [x]and they came, and were baptized.

[u] 1 Sam. ix. 4.

[x] Matt. iii. 5, 6.

24 For [y]John was not yet cast into prison.

[y] Matt. xiv. 3.

23. "Much water." Literally, "many waters."

may be thoroughly searched, so that anything of evil or imperfection in them may be done away; but not the less does God lead him to the truth, so that all may see that what he does is through a Higher Power working in him.

22. "After these things," *i.e.*, after the events recorded in John ii., the first cleansing of the temple, and the miracles He did which caused the visit of Nicodemus.

"Into the land of Judæa," *i.e.*, He left Jerusalem and began a preparatory work in the country parts.

"And baptized." The commentators, ancient and modern, are divided as to the nature of this Baptism. Some suppose that it was only a preparatory one, like that of the Baptist's, and the fact that Jesus afterwards in His Galilean ministry does not appear to have baptized, seems in accordance with such a view. Meyer thinks that this Baptism was with the Spirit, but still not the same as that after Pentecost. The Fathers seem also divided in opinion, Chrysostom and Tertullian considering that it was without the Spirit; Augustine and Cyril making no difference between this and the subsequent Christian Baptism.

23. "And John also was baptizing in Ænon near to Salim, because there was much water there." Ænon, in all probability a place in the south of Judah. Eusebius and Jerome place it in the Samaritan territory to the west of the Jordan, but this is very unlikely, seeing how the Jews were set against the Samaritans, so that they would frequently go from Jerusalem into Galilee, through Peræa, so as to avoid passing through the Samaritan portion of the Holy Land. In Joshua xv. 32, a place called Ain, signifying a spring, is named next to Shilhim, which latter place appears in the Septuagint as Salim.

24. "For John was not yet cast into prison." The reader will

25 ¶ Then there arose a question between *some* of John's disciples and the Jews about purifying.

26 And they came unto John, and said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, [z] to whom thou barest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all *men* come to him.

[z] ch. i. 7, 15, 27, 34.

27 John answered and said. [a] A man can || receive nothing, except it be given him from heaven.

[a] 1 Cor. iv. 7. Heb. v. 4. James i. 17.

[‖] Or, *take unto himself.*

28 Ye yourselves bear me witness, that I said, [b] I am not the Christ, but [c] that I am sent before him.

[b] ch. i. 20, 27. Mal. iii. 1. Mark i. 2. Luke i. 17.

---

25. "The Jews." Certain MSS., ℵ, A., B., L., read, "a Jew," so Peshito; Vulg. as in Authorized.

remember how, according to Eusebius, the principal reason which induced St. John to write his Gospel was the deficiency of the three other Evangelists in their not recording the events in our Lord's ministry which occurred before the imprisonment of John. (Eus. "Eccles. Hist." b. iii., c. 24.)

25. "Then there arose a question . . . . . purifying." If this question was about purification, it must have been respecting the relative purifying efficacy of the two Baptisms—that of Jesus and that of John—seeing that the disciples of John appealed to him for an explanation as to how it was that he continued to baptize, whilst the man to whom he bare witness as about to baptize with the Holy Ghost, was baptizing also. The question must have been of this nature, or it could not have elicited John's answer, "A man can receive nothing, except it be given him from heaven." Of course he means by this, no commission from God to act for God; and he further means that no man acting for God can exceed his commission and intrude into any province which does not by God's ordination belong to him. And so he proceeds to say,

28. "Ye yourselves bear me witness, that I said, I am not the Christ, but that I am sent before him." Why should you be jealous for my honour? I told you from the first that I was only a forerunner—a voice crying in the wilderness. When I pointed out the Lamb of God to you, my real work, so far as it concerned you, was done.

29 [d] He that hath the bride is the bridegroom: but [e] the friend of the bridegroom, which standeth and heareth him, rejoiceth greatly because of the bridegroom's voice: this my joy therefore is fulfilled.

[d] Matt. xxii. 2. 2 Cor. xi. 2. Eph. v. 25, 27. Rev. xxi. 9.
[e] Cant. v. 1.

30 He must increase, but I *must* decrease.

29. "He that hath the bride is the bridegroom . . . . this my joy therefore is fulfilled." Here the Baptist shows that though he was immeasurably inferior to Him Whose way he prepared, yet that even his place was one of extreme honour and blessedness. Among the Jews, the friend of the bridegroom asked the bride in marriage on behalf of the bridegroom, and acted as the means of communication between them during the time of the betrothal. According, then, as he loved and respected the bridegroom, he would rejoice when he heard the voice of the bridegroom welcoming the bride to her new home. Such was the office and the glory of John. By his preaching of repentance, and his baptism, he called the bride. He made ready a people prepared for the Lord. And now, having heard the voice of Jesus, and having directed to Him those who were to be the seed and nucleus of His Church, even His Apostles, his joy was fulfilled. He had borne his witness, he had done his work. And in the face of waning glory, and the multitudes flocking round the new Prophet, and it may be in the foresight of his own imprisonment and death, he rejoiced. How noble to be able to rejoice in his own depreciation and personal failure, provided the work of God prospered!

30. "He must increase, but I must decrease." My work is completed. From its very nature as a preparatory work, it must come to an end. His will go on for ever. This does not mean, "I must decrease by imprisonment and martyrdom," for the Incarnate Son had before Him an infinitely more bitter and appalling termination of His earthly Life than John had; but, "His is a permanent and ever-increasing work. He must reign till He hath put all enemies under His feet." I need scarcely say that these words represent the desire of every true servant of Christ—the desire that any personal credit which he may have had in bringing souls to Christ may be forgotten, so that "the Lord alone may be exalted."

31-36. The concluding verses of this chapter seem to be the

f ver. 13. ch. viii. 23.
g Matt. xxviii. 18. ch. i. 15, 27. Rom. ix. 5.
h 1 Cor. xv. 47.
i ch. vi. 33. 1 Cor. xv. 47. Eph. i. 21. Phil. ii. 9.

31 f He that cometh from above g is above all: h he that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth: i he that cometh from heaven is above all.

31. ℵ, D., 1, 22, 118, and some old Latin (a, b, e, f, ff, l), Cur. Syriac, read, "He that cometh from heaven testifieth what he hath seen and heard," omitting "is above all;" but A., B., L., Δ, Λ, later Uncials, almost all Cursives, old Latin (c. g, q), Vulg. Syriacs, read as in Rec. Text.

words of the Evangelist rather than of the Baptist. They belong to the highest development of doctrine respecting the Person of the Eternal Son. Words similar in thought and meaning *may* have been spoken on this occasion by the Baptist, but unquestionably the beloved Disciple must have developed them by his spiritual insight, and expressed them in that diction which among the Sacred writers is peculiar to himself.

31. "He that cometh from above is above all: he that is of the earth is earthly [of the earth], and speaketh of the earth: he that cometh from heaven [is above all, and] testifieth what he hath seen and heard." In these words, whether spoken by the Baptist or Evangelist, we have an infinite difference made between the Son of God and any human teacher whatsoever before His time. The very Baptist himself is, compared with Him, "of the earth," and "speaketh of the earth." What are the things of earth? Such things as the need of repentance, baptism for the remission of sins, belief in the Son of God; in fact, all Christian principles and duties, which, though they are heavenly as to their sanctions, have yet their sphere of action upon earth. What are the things which "He that cometh from above testifieth of, because He hath seen and heard them 'there'?" The Eternal Fatherhood of God, in contrast with His later Fatherhood through creation; the Eternal Sonship of the Son; the Spirit that proceedeth from the Father; the mutual knowledge of the Father and the Son; the co-working of the Father and the Son; the perpetual Intercession; the many mansions; the places prepared for the saints. Let the reader think how little of these things is revealed by the old Prophets, no matter how sublime their utterances, no matter how vigorous their protest against evil. Compared to the teaching of the Son of God, that of the greatest and best of His servants is "of the earth."

32 And [k] what he hath seen and heard, that he testifieth; and no man receiveth his testimony.

[k] ver. 11. ch. viii. 26. & xv. 15.

But does this apply to Apostles such as Peter, Paul, and John? Not absolutely, perhaps, because He spake in them. But there seems to be, in the utterances of Christ, that to which even such servants as St. Paul cannot reach. We cannot imagine any Apostle setting forth the Beatitudes as Christ did, or dividing all hearers into four divisions, as in the Parable of the Sower. When He speaks of the rich man and Lazarus, or of the general Judgment in which He is to set the sheep on His right and the goats on His left, He speaks as if He saw it all, as if heaven and hell were naked and open before Him. When He speaks of the relations of the Father and Himself, it is as if He was, then and ever, in the bosom of God: "I know the Father;" "I love the Father;" "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work;" "Father, glorify Thou Me with Thine own self, with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was."

32. "No man receiveth His testimony." They who have in any real sense of the word "received the testimony" of Christ, as if He were "Very God of Very God," and so have submitted to every word of His, have always been an insignificant minority. It is with true faith as it is with godly living: "Narrow is the way, and few there be that find it." It was true of the time of His dwelling amongst us, as is shown by His remonstrance, "Ye will not come unto Me that ye may have life." It seems true now. There never was in any age of the Church so much talk about faith, so much glorification of it, and yet it may be that what we call faith an Apostle would call unbelief.

33. "He that hath received his testimony hath set to his seal that God is true." This follows from what has gone before. If Christ is from above, from the Father, then His witness to any heavenly thing is the same as that of God, and to receive Him is to receive God. And the converse is fearfully true, that not to receive Him is to reject God, to make Him a liar. Harsh though this may sound to some, all experience—especially the experience of these latter days—teaches us its truth. The only God of Whom the history of our race speaks to us as having entered into any relationship with us men is the God Who gave the Christian Revelation—in other words, "Who

33 He that hath received his testimony hath set to his
[1] Rom. iii. 4. [1] John v. 10. seal that God is true.

sent His Son.' The Revelation of Himself in the Person of His Son is the only evidence which is worthy of the name of evidence that God takes an interest in the character and actions of us His creatures. If there be an eternal and supreme Justice anywhere, we ought, as a race who do good or evil to one another, to be judged. If there be an eternal and supreme Mercy anywhere, then both as a race and as individuals, we need the exercise of such Mercy. The Revelation of God through Christ teaches us what we can only learn by a Revelation: that we are redeemed from the evil in which our race is involved; and that, if we will, we may each of us be freed from its consequences; but that, anyhow, we are certain to be judged, in another state of existence, for the deeds done in this present state, in which there is no impartial and universal justice exercised. If we reject the Revelation, which, after all, resolves itself into the personal witness of Christ, then we reject as untrue the one only thing which comes to human beings as a message from the unseen God, which thing, if they are moral and responsible beings, must be infinitely more important to them than any scientific knowledge or discovery whatsoever, because it has to do with the highest and noblest part of their nature, which no discoveries of natural science can touch. If, on the contrary, we accept the testimony of Christ, then we acknowledge that God is true; that God is true in having put into each one of us a true witness to Himself that He is, and that He is a supreme Governor on the side of right and against wrong; and that He is true in that He has not deceived His creatures by the yearnings after all that is good and holy which He has put into the hearts of the best of them. So that then our means of deliverance from the evil of their race are not deceptive, but are fulfilled in Christ. Again, if we are the creatures of God, our highest conception of the Supreme Being must be the truest, and, if so, that view of Him which we get through the testimony of Christ must be the very truth: for with our present faculties we can imagine nothing higher. In the words of Christ, we have God set forth as a Spirit, as essentially a Father, as Infinite in all His attributes, as a Supreme Ruler, Redeemer, Sanctifier, and Judge.

These things answer to what is best and noblest within us; and

34 [m] For he whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God: for God giveth not the Spirit [n] by measure *unto him.*

35 [o] The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand.

[m] ch. vii. 16.
[n] ch. i. 16.
[o] Matt. xi. 27 & xxviii. 18. Luke x. 22. ch. v. 20, 22. & xiii. 3. & xvii. 2. Heb. ii. 8.

---

34. "God giveth not," &c. "God" omitted by ℵ, B., C., L., 1, 33, old Latin (b, e, f, l) retained by A., D., Γ, Δ. Λ. Π. all later Uncials, almost all Cursives, some old Latin (a, c, ff², g, q), Vulg. Syriacs, Copt. Æth.

nothing else—nothing that mere nature, or natural science, or human philosophy teaches us—does so answer.

All this is still more true of those, who, like John, believed in the Theocracy and its manifestations in the past history of the chosen people. For an Israelite to receive the testimony of Jesus was to set his seal to the truth of all to which Moses and the Prophets had witnessed.

34. "He whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God: for God giveth not the Spirit by measure [unto him]." The words "unto him" are not in the original, but they must be supplied. It cannot possibly be taken as a general truth that God giveth the Spirit in all His fulness to every man (to which only the words 'giveth not by measure' are applicable). On the contrary, as Augustine says, "We find that God doth give the Spirit by measure. Hear the Apostle saying, 'according to the measure of the gift of Christ.' To man He giveth by measure, to the only Son He giveth not by measure. How to men by measure? To one, indeed (the Apostle saith), is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit," &c. (1 Corinth. xii. 8-10.)

The drift of the verse is something of this sort. All other teachers, even Apostles, speak the Word of God through a human medium, which necessarily affects their testimony. They have the Spirit only in measure. Their human nature, to which sin still cleaves, is incapable of receiving His fulness. Whereas the Human Nature of Christ is such that He receives the Holy Spirit in all His fulness, and so His words are in no degree affected by the weakness of the medium: they are the pure, unmixed words of God.

35. "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into

p Hab. ii. 4. ch. i. 12. & vi. 47. ver. 15, 16. Rom. i. 17. 1 John v. 10.

36 p He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the

36. "He that believeth not." Properly, "He that obeyeth not"—the same word which, in an adjectival form, is used for disobedience to parents in Rom. i. 30, 2 Tim. iii. 2. The alteration of the word in the second clause shows that something more than mere "believing" is meant.

his hand." The Father loveth the Son, not only with the eternal love with which One Person in the Godhead loves another, but with the additional love (if it be lawful so to speak) with which the Father loves Him Who hath undertaken to mediate between Himself and His creatures. According to the Son's own words, "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life that I might take it again." (John x. 17.) And because of this love, and that the Son may carry out to all its issues this mediating work, the Father hath put all things into His Hands. By this we establish the connection between this verse and the next.

36. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." Why? Because the Father in committing all things into His hands has committed into His hands all spiritual life, and all things that can lead to, or produce, or advance, or perfect spiritual and eternal life. The Father has given to the Son, as Mediator, the Spirit without measure, and with that Spirit all power in heaven and in earth. He has committed to Him the headship over the Church, the government of the world—even the keys of death and hell; and so, by consequence, He that believeth on Him hath everlasting life, because belief, if a true belief, and so followed out to its proper ends, unites to Christ, and makes this Christ to Whom all things are given the soul's own.

And the terrible alternative is true, "He that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth [*i.e.*, remaineth, continueth] on him." The reader must understand that in the original, the 'believeth' in the first clause is changed into 'obeyeth' in the second: so that it is not mere barren faith which is in contemplation, but fruitful faith—faith which worketh by love. In whom there is not this faith, this purifying, loving, work-producing faith, on Him the wrath of God abideth: the Death and Resurrection of the Son of God is of no benefit to him. He continues in the original condemnation. He is by nature in a state of wrath, and he continues in it.

Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.

It is no use concealing from ourselves the fact that this terrible converse of Life and Salvation is everywhere presented to us in Scripture. There is the wheat and chaff of the Baptist's preaching, the wheat and tares of the Lord's parable, the foolish virgins, the unprofitable servant, the sheep and goats; there is the "indignation and wrath, the tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil;" there is the "Lord Jesus revealed in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the Gospel;" there is the wrath of the Lamb, and the Second Death. However we may hope that all this may be mitigated, or that God may make allowances for ignorance, or passion, or such things, it is clearly the extreme of folly to make any imagined mitigation or allowances the principal subject of contemplation, to the virtual exclusion of the terrible reality. What we have to do is to make it the business of our lives to have or to cultivate true faith in Christ, and to see that it works by love and good works in ourselves and others.

CHAP. IV.

WHEN therefore the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and [a] baptized more disciples than John,

[a] ch. iii. 22, 26.

2 (Though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples,)

3 He left Judæa, and departed again into Galilee.

---

1. "When therefore the Lord knew . . . . more disciples than John." Another intimation that the Baptist had fulfilled his mission, and that the Lord was entering on His own work. ["He must increase, but I must decrease."]

2. "Though Jesus himself baptized not," &c. Though Jesus personally did not perform the rite, it was His act, no matter what its significance. This we gather also from iii. 22.

3. "He left Judæa, and departed again into Galilee." He knew

4 And he must needs go through Samaria.

5 Then cometh he to a city of Samaria, which is called
[b] Gen. xxxiii. 19. & xlviii. 22. Josh. xxiv. 32. Sychar, near to the parcel of ground [b] that Jacob gave to his son Joseph.

---

that because the Pharisees had heard that He was more successful in winning the people, they would transfer their fear and hatred to Himself; and so He did in His own case what He had charged His disciples to do, when they were persecuted in one city to flee to another. He was to die for the world, but only when His time was come.

4. "He must needs go through Samaria." This notice seems to be inserted in the narrative, in order to show that in this journey through Samaria, and the conversion of a city in consequence of it, He did not act inconsistently with the charge He had given to His Apostles, "Into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not." (Matt. x. 5.) He took the journey through the alien territory naturally, because He desired to go by the direct route; and the incident which we have to consider occurs by the way, as it were, or as men would say, "accidentally." He did not go into the city, and perform miracles, and call upon the Samaritans to believe on Him. He seems to have avoided the suspicion of this by staying at the well without the city.

5. "A city of Samaria, called Sychar." It has been supposed that this was the ancient Sychem, corrupted into Sychar ["drunken" town, or "lying" town, town of falsehood, because of the false pretensions of its inhabitants to be a remnant of Ephraim, and to inherit traditions of worship reaching back to primitive times]. According to Dr. Thompson's account, however, it is impossible to suppose that Sychem should have been so far from the well as it actually is, as appears from the following extract: "If Nablus occupies the place of Sychem (and I suppose it does), it is one of the oldest cities in the world; nor is there anything improbable in this, for its natural advantages, great beauty, and abundant supply of water, mark out the site for a city. This latter fact, however, seems to prove that Shechem was not the Sychar mentioned in the fourth chapter of St. John. It is incredible that the 'woman of Samaria' should have gone two miles away from those delicious fountains to draw water out of an immensely deep well. If we

6 Now Jacob's well was there. Jesus therefore, being wearied with *his* journey, sat thus on the well: *and* it was about the sixth hour.

---

6. "Well;" rather, spring or fountain; *fons Jacob* (Vulg.).
"Sat thus." See below.

admit the identity of the present well of Jacob with that mentioned by St. John, there can be but little doubt that Sychar was a small Samaritan town, not far from that spot; and there is a village north of it, now called Aschâr. This is so like St. John's Sychar that I feel inclined to adopt it."

"Near to the parcel of ground which Jacob gave to his son, Joseph." This is the plot alluded to in Gen. xxxiii. 19, in which Jacob is said to have bought the land of the children of Hamor; and in Joshua xxiv. we are told that there the children of Israel buried the bones of Joseph.

6. "Now Jacob's well was there." According to Maundrell, who visited it in 1697, the digging of it must have been a work of enormous labour. "It is dug in a firm rock, and contains about three yards in diameter, and thirty-five in depth, five of which we found full of water. The rock has since crumbled, or, in other ways, the well has been in part filled up, and a recent measurement gives a depth of seventy-five feet only, the spring at the bottom being choked." (Archbishop Trench.)

"Jesus therefore, being wearied with his journey." Here we have the first intimation in this Gospel of the Lord sharing in the sinless weaknesses of His creatures. "It is not without a meaning that Jesus is weary: not, surely, without a meaning that He is weary Who is the Power of God: not, surely, without a meaning that He is weary by Whom the weary are refreshed." Again: "The strength of Christ created thee, the weakness of Christ created thee anew. The strength of Christ wrought that what was not, should be; the weakness of Christ wrought that what was, should not perish. He made us by His strength, He sought us by His weakness." (Augustine.) Again: "The weariness of Christ, so soon to be the refreshment of one, should in due time be the refreshment of all: just as His poverty is our riches, His shame our honour, and His stripes our healing." (Trench.) His weakness is our salvation. "He was crucified through weakness." The Son of God, the power of God, took a nature that could feel weariness, that He might feel

7 There cometh a woman of Samaria to draw water: Jesus saith unto her, Give me to drink.

8 (For his disciples were gone away unto the city to buy meat.)

---

for the vast multitudes of His brethren, who have to toil hard and be weary.

"Sat thus." The word is difficult to render. It is left untranslated in both Vulgate and Syriac. The revisers of 1881 have rendered it in the margin, "Sat as He was." Perhaps it may mean, "sat wearied as He was."

7. "There cometh a woman of Samaria to draw water." Not, of course, of the city of Samaria, but of the country or tribe. Her name is mentioned in both the Greek and Roman Martyrologies as Photina, and she is said to have suffered in the reign of Nero.

"Jesus saith unto her, Give me to drink." This request for what was never refused to the weary traveller, was not merely asked by the Lord that His bodily wants might be supplied, but that He might open a way to her heart, and so have the opportunity of bringing before her what would not only make her a believer, but a missionary to bring others to share the same life-giving knowledge. In order to effect this, He humbles Himself, and puts Himself into the position of a suppliant, giving her the opportunity of conferring a favour, and a very great one, if we consider that His race and her's were hereditary enemies. As Stier well expresses it, "By this very means He has approximated to the human sympathies of this Samaritan woman. A request always appeals to the existing good will of the person requested: we despise not him whose services we ask."

Humanly speaking, the chances were that He would be rudely refused, as, in fact, He was on another occasion, when under similar circumstances He sought a night's rest in one of the villages of this alien race. (Luke xi. 51.) In this request of His, and in the discourse to which it was the prelude, there was a threefold testimony against the narrow-heartedness of His age and people, against that of the Jew who hated the Samaritan, of the Rabbi who would have thought scorn to hold this familiar intercourse with a woman (see v. 27), of the Pharisee who would have shrunk from this near contact with a sinner (Luke vii. 39: xv. 2; xix. 7). (Trench.)

8. "For his disciples were gone away," &c. No doubt a party of six or eight persons (we do not know how many were as yet attached

9 Then saith the woman of Samaria unto him, How is it that thou, being a Jew, askest drink of me, which am a woman of Samaria? for [c] the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans.

[c] 2 Kings xvii. 24. Luke ix. 52, 53. Acts x. 28.

10 Jesus answered and said unto her, If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith to thee,

---

9. "For the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans," omitted by ℵ, D., and old Latin; omitted by Tischendorf; marked as doubtful by Westcott and Hort, but in B., C., L., and almost all other MSS.

to our Lord, so as to accompany Him whithersoever He went) would have had a small bucket and rope as part of their necessary travelling gear. Or, if not, owing to the depth of the well, they would bring back with them water as well as provisions. This remark is necessary to explain the reason for the request; and yet there can be no doubt that their absence, and with it the means of procuring water, was ordered, that Jesus might have opportunity for drawing out the faith of this outcast, which would have been impossible if many had been present.

9. "Then saith . . . How is that thou, being a Jew, askest," &c. This need not have been said churlishly in refusal of the Lord's request. It was the very natural expression of surprise that Jesus should have broken down the barrier of national enmity, and demeaned Himself to ask a favour of an alien.

"The Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans." This must be restricted to kindly intercourse, for the disciples had, at that very time, gone to the Samaritan city to buy food.

10. "Jesus answered . . . If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith to thee," &c. The gift of God is, of course, the Holy Spirit, but the Holy Spirit given by God to make men partakers of the nature and Redemption of Christ, and all things pertaining to it.

"Thou wouldst have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water."

Notice here how Christ speaks as God, giving, as God does, that supreme gift which is emphatically *the* gift of God, and giving to all that ask, to all that feel their need, and so believe in the Giver as to ask for the Gift. Stier has a remark respecting this gift which many commentators belonging to a more Catholic body would do well to

Give me to drink; thou wouldest have asked of him, and he would have given thee [d] living water.

[d] Is. xii. 3. & xliv. 3. Jer. ii. 13. Zech. xiii. 1. & xiv. 8.

ponder. "Expositors will never satisfactorily deal with it, while they refuse to admit the essential and natural *fulness of meaning* which this wonderful word [gift of God] suggests. It is, therefore, unwise and injudicious to say, as even some of the best of them do, that the Lord's own Person cannot be meant, because this is referred to afterwards in the words 'Who He is.'"

A question here arises which we shall have constantly to consider in the course of our exposition of this Gospel. How is it that the Lord so constantly assumes an authority and utters words of deeply mysterious import, which authority and which words it was morally impossible that those with whom He came in contact could acknowledge or understand? Consider for a moment the state of this woman's knowledge. To begin with, she belonged to a race which "knew not what they worshipped." Such terms as the "gift of God," and "living water" seem to have excited not the smallest suspicion that the Lord was speaking of spiritual things. How, again, could she know Who the Stranger was Who thus accosted her, and that as God He gave the Gift of God?

This is only one of many similar instances, recorded in this Gospel, of Jesus saying things which could only be understood in the fullest light of the Pentecostal day. There is not a chapter without some such instances. There are two sayings in this Gospel which, taken together, seem to be its key. One of these is, "There standeth one among you whom ye know not." Another, "These things understood not his disciples at the first." It is as if a man of very great knowledge and power was the companion of little children, and he says to them, now and then, things that can only be realized in mature life, and they look up and gaze and are perplexed and ask one another what he means. But the sayings are not lost. At the time they feel that he who thus speaks lives in another world besides theirs, and it does them good to believe this of him; for it is the beginning of faith to believe that there are worlds of a higher order than ours; and afterwards, perhaps after many years, the memory of the mysterious words or things returns, and with it the right understanding.

Now this Gospel appears to be written to bring out sayings and

11 The woman saith unto him, Sir, thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep: from whence then hast thou that living water?

12 Art thou greater than our father Jacob, which gave us the well, and drank thereof himself, and his children, and his cattle?

13 Jesus answered and said unto her, Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again:

14 But [e] whosoever drinketh of the water that

[e] ch. vi. 35, 58.

---

doings of Christ such as these, rather than to analyze the subjective developments of belief and unbelief in mere human beings.

11. "The woman saith unto him, Sir, thou hast nothing to draw with," &c. Commentators have seen a small glimmer of faith in that the woman now addresses the unknown stranger as Sir, Lord (Kurie), instead of "thou, a Jew;" but the word is of too common use as a title of mere respect to warrant such an inference. The Greeks, for instance, came to Philip with the words "Sir [Kurie] we would see Jesus." (John xii. 21.) The following words express the deepest ignorance, both of the gift of God, and of the dignity of Him Who had addressed her. As to the living water, she could conceive of none that could possibly be within the reach of the Stranger except the spring at the bottom of the well; and as to the Stranger Himself, we gather her opinion of Him from the question, "Art thou greater than our father Jacob, which gave us the well?"

13. "Jesus answered and said unto her, Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again." The Lord in speaking thus concerning "this water," only regards it as a symbol and similitude of every human satisfaction and every human need both in body and soul, else would the contrast, which the Lord continues to expand, fail of being all-comprehensive. All carnal pleasure such as this woman lived in, all that fleshly and unfruitful knowledge which so many men pursue, all delights and all enjoyments which this world may offer, can satisfy our thirst with a brief gratification alone, such as only in reality increases the thirst sickness which it professes to allay. (Stier.)

"Whosoever shall drink of the water that I shall give him . . . everlasting life." These words anticipate those of John vi. 35, "I

I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall
f ch. vii. 38. give him f shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life.

g See ch. vi. 34. & xvii. 2, 3. Rom. vi. 23. 1 John v. 20. 15 g The woman saith unto him, Sir, give me this water, that I thirst not, neither come hither to draw.

---

15. "Neither come hither;" perhaps, "neither come across [the fields] hither."

am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst," and other words also, in John vii. 38: "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the scripture saith, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water." They mean the gift of the Spirit first working in the soul true and living faith, and then the same Spirit crowning that faith with a real participation in the nature of the Second Man.

"Whosoever drinketh." Not merely, who drinks thereof a little, and then ceases, but a continual, earnest, full and thorough drinking, is signified. As Wesley says rightly, "provided he continues to drink thereof." (Stier.)

"Shall never thirst," *i.e.*, shall never thirst in vain. He will, in one sense, always thirst. "My soul is a-thirst for God, even for the living God;" but his thirst will never be unsatisfied. He will have within him at once the desire for God and the fruition of that desire. The gift is reproductive. The water of life wells up within him so as to satisfy his own soul and that of others. The characteristic of "living water" in a well or in a fountain is that, like a living thing, it springs up from its own depths clear and pure: not like the socage water, which drains from the surface into the pond or cistern. And so the living water of Life is not a thing, or an idea, or a principle, but a Living Person, the Lord, the Giver of Life, Who enters the soul or spirit in its depths, and abides within, and fills with good and holy thoughts the man who has received the unspeakable gift.

15. "The woman saith unto him, Sir, give me this water, that I thirst not, neither come hither to draw." This answer is also perfectly carnal. There is not a trace of any desire for the satisfaction of spiritual needs. All the benefit that she looked for was that she should not thirst, nor come toilsome walks in the noonday sun to draw; and

16 Jesus saith unto her, Go, call thy husband, and come hither.

17 The woman answered and said, I have no husband. Jesus said unto her, Thou hast well said, I have no husband:

18 For thou hast had five husbands; and he whom thou now hast is not thy husband: in that saidst thou truly.

---

yet, let the reader notice, there is an enormous advance on her former answer. That was, "Thou hast nothing to draw with;" now it is, "Give me this water." Jesus had done no miracle, but there was an indescribable authority about Him, an indescribable power about His words, which had produced faith in her towards Him. Very low faith, looking for a very poor and earthly advantage, but still faith that He could give her the living water, whatever that water was. It seems infinitely less than the grain of mustard-seed, but it was recognized by the Saviour, and made by Him the means by which He further revealed Himself, and reached her soul and spirit so as to work salvation in her.

16. "Jesus saith unto her, Go, call thy husband." How, it is asked, does the Lord so abruptly break off and bid her bring her husband? There can be but one answer. She had asked ignorantly, but in some sort of sincerity for what Jesus had to bestow, *i.e.*, the living water. She knew not what she asked, and He took her at her word; but a change must pass over her before she could either thirst for it or taste it. She must be convinced of sin. The Physician of souls must work in her repentance unto life before He can give her the water of life. And so He takes the one and only way of doing this. He brings her sins before her; He shows her her past life: how unclean and unchaste it has been. She has had five husbands, and she is now living in fornication or adultery with one who is not her husband. She had, by implication, told a falsehood when she said "I have no husband," for she was then living with a man as if she were his wife, whilst she was not. It is surprising how one commentator after another makes excuses for her. One actually suggests that the five husbands might have all died, and left her a widow five times: another that she might have been *legally* put away from each one: but does not this take from *the* teaching of the narrative, which is, the Son of Man seeking and saving the lost? Notwithstanding her past deplorable life, He saw

19 The woman saith unto him, Sir, [h] I perceive that thou art a prophet.

20 Our fathers worshipped in [i] this mountain; and ye say, that in [k] Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship.

[h] Luke vii. 16. & xxiv. 19. ch. vi. 14. & vii. 40.
[i] Judg. ix. 7.
[k] Deut. xxii. 5, 11. 1 Kings ix. 3. 2 Chron. vii. 12.

---

that in her on which His grace could lay hold. Bad though she was, she was not unreclaimable; He had power to snatch her as a brand from the burning, but this power must first be exerted in bringing her to repentance, and as a first step to conviction of sin.

19. "The woman saith unto him, Sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet. Our fathers worshipped in this mountain," &c. This may be taken in one of two ways. Either she was afraid of a further exposure of her past sinful life, and so wished to turn the conversation into another channel which yet had to do with religion, though with what was outward and ceremonial, and so would no further disturb her self-complacency; or, being convinced of the evil of her former life, she began for the first time to be really anxious how and where she was to approach God. Most modern commentators incline to the latter, and her subsequent conduct, especially the eagerness with which she invited her countrymen to learn of One Who had brought her past evil life so vividly before her, as well as the Lord speaking to her as if she was a sincere inquirer, shows plainly that she put the question in good faith, desiring to know the way to God.

20. "Our fathers worshipped in this mountain." As she was speaking to a Jew, we can scarcely think that by "our fathers" she meant the authors of the Samaritan schism, who, when they were excluded from taking part in the rebuilding of the Temple, erected a rival one on Mount Gerizim. She must rather have spoken as one led away by the false traditions which the Samaritan priests upheld, that it had been the seat of Paradise, the place where the ark rested, and where Abraham was on the point of offering up Isaac. No doubt, however, that Jacob worshipped there, as Shechem, the place where he sojourned, was at its foot.

"Ye say that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship." This was not an open question. God had strictly enjoined that in one place only where He would "set His name,"

21 Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, [l] when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father.

[l] Mal. i. 11. 1 Tim. ii. 8.

22 Ye worship [m] ye know not what: we know

[m] 2 Kings xvii. 29

---

were his people to approach Him with sacrificial worship; and the Prophet-King David was directed to fix the spot which should be the centre of such worship.

21. "Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh," &c. The exclamation of the Lord, "believe me," is unique. It implies a great and difficult truth declared, and great earnestness in declaring it. For the Lord was now, once for all, setting aside what had hitherto been a great principle in all human worship, that it should be local. The Jewish worship was strictly local, it was to be where God had set His Name and nowhere else. When the Samaritans set up their schism, instead of asserting any wider principle, they merely substituted Gerizim for Jerusalem. Each heathen deity had his particular fane where he could be best propitiated—Apollo at Delos, Minerva at Athens. Now the Lord declares the near fulfilment of the prediction of the last prophet, "From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering." (Mal. i. 11.)

22. "Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship," &c. We should scarcely have expected the Lord to have said this. We should have expected Him to have acknowledged that the Samaritans worshipped the true God, and so knew Whom they worshipped, but approached Him in a spirit of disobedience, because not according to the express commands which He had given respecting the place and manner of His service. But He now declared that they even knew not *what* they worshipped. Was this because they only accepted the Pentateuch and rejected all later books, such as the Psalms and the Prophets? It is impossible to think so, because the full Revelation of God is in the books of Moses. He is there set forth as Creator of Heaven and Earth, as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as the Deliverer of Israel, the Giver of the Holy Moral Law, the Judge of all the earth, as incorporeal, as Almighty, as loving good men, as rewarding those who seek Him, and punishing those who rebel against Him. The Prophets add

what we worship: for [n] salvation is of the Jews.

[n] Is. xi. 3. Luke xxiv. 47. Rom. ix. 4, 5.

22. "Salvation." Properly with article, "the Salvation." See below.

nothing to this by way of foundation, they only build upon it. The Samaritans, so far as regards the rest of the Scriptures, were only in the position of the Israelites in the times before Samuel, before the other books of the Bible were written. These words of our Lord point to a deeper thing, which is that the true Revelation of God cannot be contained merely in a book, but is committed to a Church, the authorized expounder of the Book, the witness to the way in which it was interpreted from the first. The experience of the last three hundred years has taught us that those who profess to accept the Bible and ignore the Church as its interpreter, fall into Rationalism and Socinianism. The true conception of God is in the creeds of the Catholic Church, and sects apart from the Church who yet hold this conception, and, as we hope, worship God knowing what they worship, do so because of the tradition, and the literature, and the presence of the Catholic Church.

"We know what we worship." Not that every nominal Jew knew God, but that those who desired had the means of doing so in a system which possessed the covenants, the service, and the promises, particularly such a promise as that in Haggai, "My Spirit remaineth among you."

"We know." Notice the plural "we." On almost every other occasion He speaks as one apart from the Jews, because He has to reprove their apostasy from His Father, so that they could not be regarded as the true spiritual children of God; but now, when He is face to face with one of another race and religion, He asserts His identity with them, and makes Himself their representative, inasmuch as they were still the elect of God.

"Salvation is of the Jews." Salvation, rather *the* Salvation in the Person of Christ, and the Redemption wrought in and by it. How is this dependent upon "We know what we worship?" Somewhat in this way. God reserved to Himself a chosen seed, to whom He gave the Law, the Prophets, the Services, the Promises, not that these should constitute a permanent religious system, but that they might be a preparation for the coming Redeemer. Not merely was the Saviour born of a Holy Race, but the Jewish state of things was the ground in which His religion was to take root and spring

23 But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in [o] spirit [p] and

[o] Phil. iii. 3
[p] ch. i. 17

up; witness the fact that the first promulgators of Christianity were all Jews; Samaria, however individuals belonging to it might be brought over, could only produce a Simon Magus.

Because salvation was thus "of the Jews," therefore they knew what they worshipped; and not, *vice versâ*, because they knew what they worshipped, therefore salvation was of them. He who set them to minister salvation to the world, as a necessary condition of this gave them to know Himself, Whom they must first know before they could declare Him to others. (Trench.)

23. "The hour cometh, and now is." "This change is at your very doors." Compare with this John v. 25, where the Lord uses the same phrase as indicating that already, at that very time, the spiritually dead had begun to hear His voice and live, and the true worshippers—true, not merely as opposed to false or hypocritical, or even formal, but those who realize the nature of true worship and its Object—"shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth."

God the Father is the ultimate Object of all worship. "Through Him [Christ] we have access by one Spirit unto the Father." The Eucharistic Service, the special Christ-ordained service of the Church, is, so far as it is an act of worship, directed to the Father only, because it is the setting forth before Him of the one all-sufficient Sacrifice of His Son.

"In spirit and in truth." These words have, of necessity, two meanings—a lower and a higher one. First, with evident reference to what the Lord has just said, they mean that worship is henceforth not to be local, but in spirit. The human soul or spirit is now henceforth to be, if we may use the words, the place or sphere of worship: so that unless worship is offered there, it is not true worship. And if offered there, if it is the product of our spirits, it is "in truth," *i.e.*, true and sincere worship. The only true worship is that which is independent of outward place and circumstance. But we cannot be content with this exposition. The teaching of Christ through the Spirit in the Apostles, assures us that the Holy Spirit is given to us that, in and through Him, we may "pray in the Holy Ghost." He pervades our spirits, and shows us

in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him.

q 2 Cor. iii. 17. 24 q God *is* a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship *him* in spirit and in truth.

---

our needs, and prompts and chastens each aspiration, and excites the desires, and gives warmth, and earnestness, and energy to our souls. Thus He helpeth our infirmities (Rom. viii. 26), and we pray in the Spirit (Jude 20). There can be no "truth" in worship, except prayer be according to *the* truth of the Gospel. The only true conception of the God Whom we worship is given to us through the Gospel. Through "the faith once delivered to the saints" we know the Nature, the Love, the Eternal Fatherhood of God, and His reconciliation of our race to Himself through the Redemption of Christ. For us to worship God in *the* truth, is to worship Him relying on the Atonement and perpetual Intercession of His Son.

"The Father seeketh such to worship him." Worship is converse with God. God has made His creatures capable of both knowing Him and holding converse with Him; and here His Son assures us that His Father is not indifferent to, but looks for, the loving, intelligent, free converse of us His children.

Is this converse, then, because it is "in spirit," to be altogether apart from forms, set times, places, buildings, altars? No. As to forms, Christ has taught us a form, and it requires a great gift of the Spirit—a deep sense both of sonship and of holiness—to fully enter into the spirit of this prayer. Common sense also teaches us that though we *can* pray at all times, yet that we *must* have also set times for prayer, as we have for all other serious businesses or occupations. If, too, we are not always to pray solitarily, but in fellowship, there must be places where we can meet our fellow Christians, and it is well that such places, if possible, be suited in their outward appointments to the solemnity and awfulness of prayer to such a being as God. And as to altars and the Eucharistic worship which is associated with them, they who have ever attempted to offer it spiritually, know well that there is no worship which requires such collectedness of spirit, such elevation of soul, such realization of the one all-sufficient Sacrifice, such faith in the intercession of the Great High Priest, such belief in the Unseen.

24. "God is [a] Spirit." There seems to be an advance here. God being the eternal, all-pervading existence, is not only above all time and place; but God is Spirit, *i.e.*, He is understanding, knowledge,

25 The woman saith unto him, I know that Messias cometh, which is called Christ: when he is come, [r] he will tell us all things.

[r] ver. 29, 39.

26 Jesus saith unto her, [s] I that speak unto thee am *he*.

[s] Matt. xxvi. 63, 64. Mark xiv. 61, 62. ch. ix. 37.

---

reason, will, love, and must be worshipped correspondingly, with the understanding, the knowledge, the reason, the will, the love of the creatures who can exercise these spiritual qualities because He has made them in His image after His likeness.

25. "The woman saith unto him, I know that Messias cometh, which is called Christ." The words "which is called Christ" are an explanation thrown in by the Evangelist writing for Gentiles living far from the centre of Jewish Messianic hopes.

"He will tell us all things." This is the only idea of the Messiah which the Samaritans, who rejected all the Old Testament except the Pentateuch, could have, for the only direct prophecy of the Messiah in the book of Moses is, that He should be one like unto Moses, and God would put His words in His mouth, and that He should speak unto the people all that God commanded. (Deut. xviii. 18.)

Defective though this view was, it had the advantage of being completely apart from all political considerations, and so the Samaritans were free from the principal stumbling-block which stood in the way of the worldly Jews in accepting Christ.

26. "I that speak unto thee am he." How wonderful the ways of Christ, that He should hide Himself from the teachers of religion, and the expounders of the written Word, and reveal Himself more fully to this fallen woman than He did to any, except His Apostles! And yet it was only fitting that it should be so, for, as Chrysostom says, "the woman was more fair-minded than the Jews; they did not inquire to learn, but always to mock at Him, for had they desired to learn, the teaching which was by His words, and by the Scriptures, and by His miracles, would have been sufficient. The woman, on the contrary, said what she said from an impartial judgment, and from a simple mind, as is plain from what she did afterwards; for she both heard and believed, and netted others also, and in every circumstance we may observe her carefulness and faith."

27 ¶ And upon this came his disciples, and marvelled that he talked with the woman: yet no man said, What seekest thou? or, Why talkest thou with her?

28 The woman then left her waterpot, and went her way into the city, and saith to the men,

[t] ver. 25. 29 Come, see a man, [t] which told me all things that ever I did: is not this the Christ?

30 Then they went out of the city, and came unto him.

---

27. "The woman." Without article, "a woman."

29. "Is not this the Christ?" More literally, "Can this be the Christ?" but see below.

27. "And upon this came his disciples, and marvelled that he talked," &c. Marvelled that He demeaned Himself to talk with a Samaritan outcast, marvelled, perhaps, that He set at nought the traditions of the elders, not to speak to a woman in public, much less instruct her about the law.

"Yet no man said, What seekest thou? or, Why talkest thou with her?" Still in their amazement they did not ask Him the reason, so well were they taught to keep the station of disciples, so much did they fear and reverence Him.

28. "The woman then left her waterpot, and went her way into the city, and saith," &c. So eager was she to communicate the knowledge of the wondrous stranger to others besides herself. How true to nature is this notice of the woman's eagerness! None but an eye-witness would have mentioned such a thing. No one would have invented it.

29. "Come, see a man, which told me all things." This is also most natural. The Lord had told her, almost in one sentence, the leading facts of her past sinful life, and conscious of His knowing all the rest, she exaggerated it as "All things whatsoever I did."

"Is not this the Christ?" The words literally rendered are, "Can this be the Christ?" and require a negative answer; but this is impossible. The woman evidently meant to suggest that He was the Christ. This is one of a considerable number of instances in which a rendering punctiliously grammatical makes nonsense.

30. "Then they went out of the city, and came [were coming] unto him. In the mean while his disciples," &c. . . . "Hath any man

31 ¶ In the mean while his disciples prayed him, saying, Master, eat.

32 But he said unto them, I have meat to eat that ye know not of.

33 Therefore said the disciples one to another, Hath any man brought him *ought* to eat?

34 Jesus saith unto them, "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work.

[u] Job xxiii. 12. ch. vi. 38. & xvii. 4. & xix. 30.

35 Say not ye, There are yet four months, and *then* cometh

---

brought him ought to eat? Jesus saith unto them, My meat is to do the will of him that sent me," &c. This is one of those numerous passages which show how feebly the Apostles, before the day of Pentecost, apprehended the spiritual meaning of their Master's words. He told them to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, and they could only think of the leaven of bread. They would not hear of His Death. They questioned what He could mean by His rising again. In recording these instances of their own slowness of heart they witness to the spirit of truthfulness which the Saviour had instilled into them, for they never hesitated to put down in their histories what was so disgraceful to themselves, and they also show how impossible it was that any one but Himself should have put forth that spiritual system which bears the name of their Master.

32. "I have meat to eat that ye know not of." 34. "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me," &c. The will of God is that men should be brought unto His Son. The work of God which, in His all-wise purposes, He puts into the hands of human labourers, is the actually bringing them unto His Son, and, as a preliminary condition, to faith in Him. When the Lord sees the beginnings of faith, He sees the work of God begun, and this sustains His Spirit, and as, at times, any elevation of spirit makes us forget all bodily wants, so much more with Him, He forgot His hunger in the satisfaction of His soul's most earnest desire.

35. "Say not ye, There are yet four months, and then cometh harvest? . . . . white already to harvest." Commentators are divided as to whether this first clause, "There are yet four months, and

harvest? behold, I say unto you, Lift up your eyes, and
x Matt. ix. 37. Luke x. 2. look on the fields; x for they are white already
to harvest.

y Dan. xii. 3. 36 y And he that reapeth receiveth wages, and

---

35. "Already" [Gk]. This word is the last in the verse, and is sometimes taken with the first clause of the next verse, "and" being omitted. Thus it reads, "Already he that reapeth receiveth wages," &c.

then cometh harvest," is a proverbial saying, to express the necessary length of time between seed time and harvest, *i.e.*, between the commencement and the completion of all human works; or whether it describes what was then before their eyes, that the broad, fertile wheat-fields in that rich valley would not be fit for the sickle for four months. (As the reaping began in April, this must have happened in the beginning or middle of December.) The spiritual lessons, however, are the same. The spiritual harvest is not under the same conditions of time as is the earthly one. Between the earthly sowing and reaping there must be an interval of some months. The spiritual or heavenly sowing and reaping may be simultaneous. The seed may fall into hearts where it may be long hidden, or it may at times far more quickly spring up and bear fruit. The jailer may be converted, and baptized, and become a rejoicing Christian in one night. The nation may be born in a day. The laws or conditions of the spiritual harvest which quicken or retard the springing up or ripening of the seed of the word are known only to God.

"I say unto you, Lift up your eyes, and look on the fields," &c. It is often said that this must have been suggested by the sight of the men of the city trooping out to see the Prophet who could reveal to anyone the whole of his past life; but there was scarcely time for this. May it not have a wider application? May not the Lord look to the ingathering speedily to come (*i.e.*, within two years' time) on the day of Pentecost, and the Gentiles crowding into the Church, and becoming obedient to the faith, just as when the Greeks (John xii. 20-24) desired to see Him, He saw in it a token of the Resurrection power of His Body?

Of course, the harvest here is not the final harvest at the end of the world, but the gathering of souls into the Church.

36. "He that reapeth receiveth wages, and gathereth fruit unto life eternal," &c. Some join the "already" of the last verse with

gathereth fruit unto life eternal: that both he that soweth and he that reapeth may rejoice together.

37 And herein is that saying true, One soweth, and another reapeth.

---

the first clause of this: "Already he that reapeth receiveth wages." Whether this rendering be right or not, it is a truth that "already," even now, the spiritual reaper receiveth wages.

What are these wages? They are not the reward at the Last Day, or of the future state; but a joy here—the joy of harvest: such as St. Paul experienced when he wrote to the Thessalonians, "Ye are our glory and joy." There can be no greater joy to a true servant of God than that God, through his instrumentality, either brings souls into the Church of Christ, or arouses them from the benumbing slumber of sin to see the spiritual realities of that Church or Kingdom of which they have long been nominal members, but of the glories of which they have been unconscious.

"Gathereth fruit unto life eternal." Gathereth souls to live for ever in the presence of God, "that both he that soweth and he that reapeth may rejoice together."

This rejoicing together is, of course, at the last—in the time of reward. The significance of the "that" [*that* both he that soweth and he that reapeth] depends on the eternal duration of the life to the gathering of whose fruit both the sower and reaper contribute. In the natural or temporal harvest, the sower and reaper need not rejoice together, because they may be separated, and the grain which they gather perishes in the using. Whereas the heavenly sowing, as well as the heavenly reaping, is of that which lasts for ever; and so, in the eternal world, all the servants of God, not only those who have reaped, but those who have sown in tears, in disappointment, and opposition, and seeming failure, will see clearly what share God has given to them in carrying out His purposes respecting each soul, and will equally rejoice with him who has actually gathered it.

37. "And herein is that saying true, One soweth, and another reapeth." How true is this saying now amongst us at this present time. One soweth, by early catechizing and instruction, by careful training of the babes in Christ, by watchfulness over them, and prayer for them. "And another reapeth." "Another" gives the final impression which, as it were, seals them for Christ, receives

38 I sent you to reap that whereon ye bestowed no labour: other men laboured, and ye are entered into their labours.

39 ¶ And many of the Samaritans of that city believed on [a] ver. 29. him [z] for the saying of the woman, which testified, He told me all that ever I did.

40 So when the Samaritans were come unto him, they besought him that he would tarry with them: and he abode there two days.

---

them to communion, and, it may be, sets them their work in the Church; and yet how often do we find the "reaper" claiming all for himself, and accounting the previous preparation and early instruction as nothing, though, perhaps, performed with far more expenditure of care and labour and anxiety and even tears.

38. "I sent you to reap that whereon ye bestowed no labour . . . entered into their labours." The application of this to the case of the Samaritans, to whom it seems to refer, is more difficult than is commonly supposed. For who are the "other men" who laboured? Some suppose them to be Christ Himself; some, the old Jewish prophets. All these had toiled, and the current belief in God, and the almost universal expectation of a Messiah, was the result.

But Christ, as far as we know, had never preached to the Samaritans; and they did not receive, and were most probably unacquainted with, the Jewish Prophets. May not God have raised up amongst these very Samaritans witnesses to Himself, whose names have not come down to us, and whose labours were in secret, and not heard of beyond the borders of their little city? There must be some way of accounting for the readiness with which the inhabitants of this place received Christ; and our Lord certainly implies that this readiness was not accidental, so to speak, but the work of, to us, unknown labourers.

39. "And many of the Samaritans of that city . . . . all that ever I did." Marvellous is the contrast between their belief, on seemingly very slight evidence, and the unbelief of Chorazin and Bethsaida, after all the mighty works He had done in them. But both Scripture and daily life are full of instances of those who have fewest advantages making the most of them, and of those who have most opportunities throwing them away.

40. "So when the Samaritans . . . . two days." Did the work

41 And many more believed because of his own word;

42 And said unto the woman, Now we believe, not because of thy saying: for [a] we have heard *him* ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world.

[a] ch. xvii. 8. 1 John iv. 14.

43 ¶ Now after two days he departed thence, and went into Galilee.

---

42. "The Christ" omitted by ℵ, B., C., 69, 71, and a few other Cursives, old Latin (a, b, c, ff², l), Vulg., Copt., Cur. Syriac, &c., retained by A., D., L., all later Uncials, most Cursives, old Latin (e, f, g), and Syriac (Schaaf).

of Christ among them prepare the way for the ready reception of the preaching of Philip in the neighbouring city of Sebaste, the Samaria (Shomeroon) of the Old Testament; or was Sychar itself the city of Samaria to which the Evangelist "went down and preached Christ?" I cannot help inclining to the latter view. What more likely than that, at the dispersion on the death of Stephen, a city of Samaria should be selected in which Christ had already begun the work, and so sanctioned the mission?

41. "Many more believed . . . . Saviour of the world." "In all this matter (writes Archbishop Trench) the woman may be said to have fulfilled for her fellow countrymen the office which the Church fulfils for her children. She, too, witnesses of Christ; and then those who are brought to Him through this witness find in Him such fulness of grace and truth, that they set to their own seals that He is the Christ, and have another and a better witness of this in themselves."

It is very remarkable that whilst even the Apostles, till just before the day of Pentecost, looked upon Christ as a Restorer of the kingdom to Israel, the Samaritans accepted Him as the Saviour of the world. Christ must have taught them this during His short sojourn among them, and the very fact of their minds not being preoccupied, as the minds of the Jews were, with low and carnal views of what the Messiah was to be, would be a help to them in believing in the universality of His salvation.

43. "Now after two days he departed thence . . . no honour in his own country." "His own country" here must mean Judæa, and if we consider that He was "of the house and lineage of David," and consequently the city of His ancestors was first Bethlehem and

44 For [b]Jesus himself testified, that a prophet hath no honour in his own country.

45 Then when he was come into Galilee, the Galilæans received him, [c]having seen all the things that he did at Jerusalem at the feast: [d]for they also went unto the feast.

46 So Jesus came again into Cana of Galilee, [e]where he made the water wine. And there was a certain ‖ nobleman, whose son was sick at Capernaum.

47 When he heard that Jesus was come out of Judæa into Galilee, he went unto him, and besought him that he would come down, and heal his son: for he was at the point of death.

[b] Matt. xiii. 57. Mark vi. 4. Luke iv. 24.

[c] ch. ii. 23. & iii. 2.

[d] Deut. xvi. 16.

[e] ch. ii. 1, 11.

‖ Or, *courtier*, or, *ruler*.

---

then Jerusalem [the city of the Great King], the words are not inappropriate; though, of course, there is the difficulty that He spent His youth in Nazareth, which was on that account called "His own city," and to whose inhabitants this very proverb is applied. (Matth. xiii. 57, Luke iv. 24.) St. Augustine felt the difficulty, and gave the passage a mystical explanation which it is difficult to apprehend. Others explain it that He avoided Nazareth and went into another part of Galilee. Others suppose that the words of the next verse, "the Galilæans received him, having seen all the things that he did at Jerusalem," supply the key. Knowing that the Galilæans would not honour Him, on account of His being one of themselves, He first exercised a ministry of miracles and preaching in Jerusalem, and then departed into Galilee, where He was received, but would not have been unless the fame of His mighty works in Jerusalem had preceded Him.

46. "There was a certain nobleman, whose son was sick at Capernaum." Probably a courtier or high officer of Herod Antipas.

47. "When he heard that Jesus was come out of Judæa into Galilee, he went unto him . . . point of death." He went a journey of about twenty miles to prefer this request to Jesus, which certainly seems to show that he had at least the average faith of those who came to Christ for the exercise of His power of healing.

48 Then said Jesus unto him, [1]Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe. [1] Or, 1 22.

49 The nobleman saith unto him, Sir, come down ere my child die.

50 Jesus saith unto him, Go thy way; thy son liveth. And the man believed the word that Jesus had spoken unto him, and he went his way.

51 And as he was now going down, his servants met him, and told *him*, saying, Thy son liveth.

---

51. "Thy son liveth." A, ℵ B, C, Vulg., "that his son lived," omitting "saying."

48. "Then said Jesus unto him, Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe." It is more difficult than appears at first sight to account for this reproof on the part of Christ. The words are certainly said by way of reproach, and are much used by Rationalists, who desire to get rid of miracles altogether, to show that the faith which depends upon signs is a very imperfect faith compared to that which accepts Christ on account of His preaching or teaching. And so they insinuate that miracles, being comparatively useless, may be first ignored, and then all sorts of devices may be innocently used for eliminating them from the narrative. But all this is beside the mark, for the faith which accepts Christ as a Saviour from sin does not at this stage of the narrative come at all into consideration. The nobleman beseeches Jesus to perform the miracle, not to confirm his religious faith, but to heal his child. His one object in coming was the recovery of his son, probably his only son. His faith might be established without a miracle, but surely his child could not be healed without one! Christ did not heal by natural means, but by a word, by a single touch, and for the exercise of this power for a temporal, rather than for a spiritual purpose, the nobleman came and sought His help.

One of two things is certain, either that our Lord referred to something in his state of mind utterly unknown to us, or, which is more probable, that the nobleman had but a half-belief that our Lord could effect the cure of his son. Chrysostom seems to put true interpretation on our Lord's words, and appeals to the fact that when the nobleman reached home he inquired of his servants at what hour the fever had left his child, and it was not till he

52 Then enquired he of them the hour when he began to amend. And they said unto him, Yesterday at the seventh hour the fever left him.

53 So the father knew that *it was* at the same hour, in the which Jesus said unto him, Thy son liveth: and himself believed, and his whole house.

---

found that it was at the same hour in which Jesus had said "Thy son liveth," that he was fully persuaded of the almighty power of Christ. He (Chrysostom) accounts for the fact that he came to Jesus, and so showed some faith, on this ground—that parents in their great affliction are wont to resort not only to physicians in whom they have confidence, but also to take up with those in whom they have no confidence, desiring to omit nothing by which they can possibly receive benefit for their children. On this hypothesis, what our Lord meant was, that this man and many like him, such as the people of Nazareth, desired to see miracles wrought upon others before they could firmly believe that our Lord actually had the supernatural power which He claimed to have. The miracles which the Galilæans had seen our Lord perform in Jerusalem ought to have been sufficient to dispel any doubt as to His power. Chrysostom may have judged this man somewhat too harshly, but certainly his case presents a striking contrast to that of the centurion from the very same place. The centurion is an example of a strong faith, this of a weak faith; the centurion counts that if Jesus will but say the word his servant will be healed, whilst this nobleman is so earnest that the Lord should come down, because he limits Christ's power, and considers that His actual presence only will avail; and so the one has the highest praise possible given to him by Christ, whilst the other is, at the first, rebuked.

53. "So the father knew . . . himself believed, and his whole house." This notice of the household believing is so similar to several cases in the Acts, as that of Lydia and of the jailer, that we cannot but think that this was religious belief in Jesus as the Christ, and not merely belief in His power of healing. Some have even supposed that this man was Chuza, Herod's steward.

54. "This is again the second miracle . . . out of Judæa into Galilee." This should be rendered, "This again a second sign did

54 This *is* again the second miracle *that* Jesus did, when he was come out of Judæa into Galilee.

Jesus, having come out of Judæa into Galilee." I cannot help thinking that we must look to the reason assigned by antiquity for the composition of this Gospel to explain the interjection of this remark. St. John wrote to describe that which the other Evangelists had omitted, the ministry previous to the incarceration of the Baptist. The chief incidents of this occurred in Jerusalem, but two occurred in Galilee and in Cana, of which the Synoptics had said nothing; and this is mentioned as the second in Cana, thereby showing that this Evangelist knew well the Galilean ministry, though his object was to describe a ministry in another part of the Holy Land.

CHAP. V.

AFTER [a] this there was a feast of the Jews; and Jesus went up to Jerusalem.

[a] Lev. xxiii. 2. Deut. xvi. 1. ch. ii. 13.

---

1. "A feast." So A., B., D., G., K., S., U V. Γ, Δ, and most Cursives; but ℵ, C., E., F., H., L., M., Δ, Π, fifty Cursives, Sah. Copt. read "the feast."

1. "After this there was a feast of the Jews; and Jesus went up to Jerusalem." There is the greatest difference of opinion amongst commentators as to which feast of the Jews this was.

If we read it *the* feast of the Jews, no doubt the Passover is meant. As Archbishop Trench remarks, "All other feasts fall into the background for a Jew, as compared with the Passover; *the feast* with no further addition or qualification could hardly mean any other feast but this." (John iv. 45, Matt. xxvii. 15.) If it be *a* feast, one of the inferior feasts must be meant, and many commentators have thought that it was Purim. The only reason against this seems to be that Purim was not kept religiously by the mass of Jews, and it is assumed that our Lord went up to keep the feast. But as it was kept as a great festival of national deliverance, He may have observed it religiously, though His countrymen did not.

2 Now there is at Jerusalem [b] by the sheep ‖ *market* a pool, which is called in the Hebrew tongue Bethesda, having five porches.

[b] Neh. iii. 1. & xii. 39.
‖ Or, *gate.*

3 In these lay a great multitude of impotent folk, of blind, halt, withered, waiting for the moving of the water.

---

2. "Bethesda." So A., C., most later Uncials, and most Cursives; "Bethzatha," ℵ, L.; "Bethsaida," B.

3. "In these lay a great multitude of impotent folk, of blind, halt, withered," &c.; rather, "A great multitude of sick, blind, halt, withered." No word answering to "folk" after word rendered "impotent;" *multitudo magna languentium, cæcorum, claudorum, aridorum* (Vulg.).

"Waiting for the moving of the water" omitted by ℵ, A., B., C., L., 18, 157, 314; but D., later Uncials, most Cursives, most old Latin, retain it.

2. "Now there is at Jerusalem by the sheep market a pool." Rather, by the sheep gate. Nothing can be gathered from the present tense being used here respecting an earlier date of the Gospel as written before the destruction of Jerusalem (it being assumed that the pool would be destroyed with the destruction of the city), for St. John might easily have written as if he had the whole scene before him, and so spake of the past as if it were then existing.

"A pool, which is called in the Hebrew tongue Bethesda." If verses 3 (latter part) and 4 are genuine, then this may be any pool or cistern within the circuit of the walls. If, on the contrary, verse 4 is not genuine, then we have to account for the "moving of the water," recognized in verse 7, in some other way than by an angelic ministry. In this case it is most probable that the pool was fed from below by an intermittent spring, which welled up at irregular times, which required that those waiting to be healed should continually be on the watch, so that they might be plunged into it the moment it boiled up, this being supposed to be the time when the water was efficacious. Now there is at present in Jerusalem such an intermittent spring, called the Fountain of the Virgin, which discharges itself by a long tunnel into the Pool of Siloam, and many suppose that this is the actual pool. As it exists at present, however, there is no room about it for the five porches. After such a lapse of time, and so many destructions of Jerusalem, it seems impossible to identify the site.

"Having five porches." Five spaces roofed over for the shelter of those who "waited for the moving of the water."

3. "In these lay a [great] multitude of impotent folk," literally,

4 For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had.

5 And a certain man was there, which had an infirmity thirty and eight years.

6 When Jesus saw him lie, and knew that he had been

---

4. "For an angel," &c. This whole verse omitted by ℵ. B., C*., D., and a few Cursives, but retained by A., C., E., F., G., H., I., K., L., most Cursives, old Latin (a, b, c, e, f), Vulg., Peshito. But see excursus.

5. "Which had an infirmity thirty and eight years." "Which had been thirty and eight years in his infirmity." *Triginta et octo annos habens in infirmitate sua* (Vulg.).

of sick, blind, halt, withered. No word answering to "folk" after the word rendered "impotent."

4. "For an angel went down . . . of whatsoever disease he had." In a short excursus at the end of this Gospel I have examined the question of the genuineness of this passage. The reader, however, should very distinctly realize that the healing bestowed on those who were the first to descend into the water was in no sense one of our Lord's miracles. It did not in any way witness to *His* mission: and we cannot gather from the account that He recognized in the least degree its genuineness. His whole conduct is perfectly consistent with the fact that those who waited were mistaken in supposing that the water had any healing virtue from the stirring of an angel, or from any other cause. Supposing that such persons were under a delusion, they would not have listened to Him if He had attempted to show them their mistake. The very fact, also, of His making no allusion to a work of His Father, performed constantly on the spot, whilst He healed the impotent man by His own power, seems to cast doubt upon the benefit which the crowd was waiting for. It is not at all improbable that His own act of instantaneous healing of such an inveterate disorder may have (in part, at least) been done to convince them that, by His Presence amongst them, they had a far speedier and surer means of being cured than that which they looked for from the agitation of the pool.

5. "And a certain man was there, which had," &c. This, of course, does not imply that the man had been all these years an attendant at the side of the pool.

6. "When Jesus saw him lie, and knew that he had been now a

now a long time *in that case*, he saith unto him, Wilt thou be made whole?

7 The impotent man answered him, Sir, I have no man, when the water is troubled, to put me into the pool: but while I am coming, another steppeth down before me.

c Matt. ix. 6. Mark ii. 11. Luke v. 24.

8 Jesus saith unto him, [c] Rise, take up thy bed, and walk.

---

6. "Wilt thou be made whole?" "Dost thou wish to be made whole?"

long time," &c. He knew it by His own Divine Intuition. It has been suggested that He knew it through the information of the by-standers, but this is most improbable; for the narrative implies very distinctly that the man was friendless, which is very inconsistent with the fact that those about him volunteered information respecting the hardness of his lot to a perfect stranger.

"Wilt thou be made whole?" Why this question? It has been supposed to have been asked for the purpose of exciting his hope, which had well nigh withered, and through that his faith; but it seems to me to have been put for the purpose of calling out the answer which showed that he knew not the Lord Jesus, and so could have neither faith nor hope that the total stranger Who accosted him could heal him.

7. "The impotent man answered him, Sir, I have no man," &c. He thinks of nothing but the pool, and is totally unconscious of any presence greater than that of the angel. There can be no doubt from his answer, that the troubling of the water took place unexpectedly, and so at irregular intervals, that the water was believed to have healing power only at the moment of its agitation, and that it took effect on one person only. All this inclines us to believe that it was not an act of God, for if so, it would be the sole case on record in which a Divine intervention was out of the reach of the friendless, and confined to those who could hire others to watch beside them to take advantage of the uncertain moment of the angel's descent.

8. "Jesus saith unto him, Rise, take up thy bed, and walk." This is one of the few cases in which the Lord heals without demanding faith in His power to do so in those who were capable of exercising that faith. The man assuredly did not look to be healed by Christ. At the utmost he might have supposed that the benevo-

9 And immediately the man was made whole, and took up his bed, and walked: and [d] on the same day was the sabbath.

[d] ch. ix. 14

10 ¶ The Jews therefore said unto him that was cured, It is the sabbath day: [e] it is not lawful for thee to carry *thy* bed.

[e] Ex. xx. 10. Neh. xiii. 19. Jer. xvii. 21, &c. Matt. xii. 2. Mark ii. 24. & iii. 4. Luke vi. 2. & xiii. 14.

9. "The same day was the Sabbath." "Now on that day was the Sabbath" (Alford).

lent stranger who accosted him, and showed an interest in his case, might have the means to help him to be lifted into the pool when the water was troubled.

But Jesus looking into him, and seeing in him that spirit of piety and thankfulness which is akin to faith in Him (for He found him afterwards in the temple) healed him at once in the most direct way, without even touching him as He was wont to do.

"Rise, take up thy bed, and walk."

The word was with power. The man, in a moment, felt a change pass through him. A new strength took possession of him. He found that he could rise, and he raised himself up at once, in obedience to the Lord's word. But the strength must precede the obedience.

There was room, however, for faith in the completeness of the healing. For though for thirty-eight years he had no experience of power in his limbs, he, without a moment's hesitation, believed that he could do what he was commanded. "He took up his bed and walked," *i.e.*, went home with it.

But God, for the further honour of His Son, so ordered it that he did not reach home without interruption, for

"On the same day was the sabbath," and there crossed his path Jews, *i.e.*, Jews of consideration, upholders of the Law and tradition, who would not for a moment suffer the Law to be broken in their presence.

10. "The Jews therefore said unto him that was cured, It is [the] sabbath [day]: it is not lawful for thee to carry thy bed." A pallet or mat, or perhaps a thin mattress, sufficient for a man to lie upon, would, when rolled up, seem such a burden as God, by the mouth of Jeremiah, had forbidden the Israelites to carry on

11 He answered them, He that made me whole, the same said unto me, Take up thy bed, and walk.

12 Then asked they him, What man is that which said unto thee, Take up thy bed, and walk?

---

12. "Thy bed" omitted by ℵ, B., C*., L.; but A., D., most later Uncials and Cursives, Vulg., and Cureton and Peshito Syriacs read as in Received Text.

the Sabbath. (Jer. xvii. 21.) The Jews were right in at first calling to this man's remembrance the sanctity of the Sabbath. From all that we can gather from the Old Testament, the laws respecting the Sabbath were intended to be very strictly observed till, of course, "the times of Reformation."

11. "He answered them, He that made me whole, the same said unto me, Take up thy bed, and walk." This answer means, that a higher Power, a power evidently that of God Himself, had absolved him from the sin of carrying his bed, just as it had loosed him from his infirmity. And unconsciously, no doubt, but by the secret leading of the Spirit, he drew the right inference from the act of Christ, that One Who could in a moment restore him, after he had been impotent thirty-eight years, had power from God to set aside, in this case, the strict law of the Sabbath. The absolution of the man sick of the palsy (Matt. ix. 1, &c.) was an exactly parallel case. No one had a right to assume to forgive sins but God, but if one who could not move a limb was bid to "Arise, and take up his bed, and go to his house," and the word of the Man Who said this was effectual, it was a proof that the Son of Man could assume, without blasphemy, the authority to forgive sin. The One Who could say with power in either case, "Rise, take up thy bed," could both loose the burden of sin, and also loose the burden of the Legal Sabbath.

12. "Then asked they him, What man is that which said," &c. Notice they did not ask, "Who is he that bade thee arise, and so healed thee?" but, "What man is that which said unto thee, Take up [thy bed] and walk?" This was in accordance with the whole of their conduct respecting Jesus, as given both in the Synoptics and St. John. Their prejudices, or rather their sins, blinded them to the natural significance of such instances of Divine Power as Christ perpetually displayed. Those amongst them who had moral power to overcome such prejudices could freely confess, "We know

13 And he that was healed wist not who it was: for Jesus had conveyed himself away, ‖ a multitude being in *that* place.

‖ Or, *from the multitude that was.*

14 Afterward Jesus findeth him in the temple, and said unto him, Behold, thou art made whole: [f] sin no more, lest a worse thing come unto thee.

[f] Matt. xii. 45. ch. viii. 11

13. "Had conveyed himself away." *Declinavit a turbâ constitutâ in loco* (Vulg.) "Had escaped—glided away."

that thou art a Teacher come from God, for no man can do these miracles that thou doest except God be with him."

13. "And he that was healed wist not," &c. A man who, by reason of his infirmity, could not move about, and who had been waiting by the pool all the time that Jesus was in Jerusalem, was not likely to know Him at first sight.

"Jesus had conveyed himself away," literally, had glided out, that the testimony of the man as a witness might be unsuspected. They could not discredit him as a follower of Jesus (as they attempted in the case of the blind man of chap. ix.) if he did not even know Him by sight.

14. "Afterward Jesus findeth him in the temple . . . worse thing come unto thee." No doubt he was there to give thanks for his cure; and it was there, when his heart was softened, and all the hallowing associations of the house of God around him, that Jesus "found him," knowing of his coming to the temple, and seeking him in order that He might warn him in the words—

"Sin no more, lest a worst thing come unto thee."

I cannot think that these words imply that this particular man's disease was the punishment for some sin which he had committed in early youth. They rather seem to teach that all temporal evil is the consequence of sin, and that such things as diseases are sent to us in mercy, to warn us, by the pain which we now suffer, of what God can inflict if we go on in a course of sin and of neglect of His Remedial Mercy.

"A worse thing." A punishment in the future world far worse than thirty-eight weary years of distress in this world. How much worse God only knows, but He warns us in words which, though few, are of very terrible significance.

15 The man departed, and told the Jews that it was Jesus, which had made him whole.

16 And therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, and sought to slay him, because he had done these things on the sabbath day.

---

16. "And sought to slay him" omitted by ℵ, B., C., D., L., old Latin, Vulg., and Cureton Syriac; retained by A., later Uncials, most Cursives, and Peshito.

15. "The man departed, and told the Jews," &c. This apparently was not done out of treachery. Not knowing Jesus, he was not likely to have heard of the hostility with which He is supposed to have been, at this time, regarded by the heads of the Jewish people. Chrysostom draws attention to his putting forward the miracle of healing rather than the obnoxious command. "Again, observe him continuing in the same right feeling: he saith not, 'This is He who said, Take up thy bed,' but when they continually advanced this seeming charge, he continually puts forward the defence, again declaring his Healer, and seeking to attract and attach others to Him. . . . The words are words of boldness and candour. He proclaims his Benefactor no less than the blind man did."

16. "And therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus [and sought to slay him]," &c. When we blame these wretched Jews for their malice and intolerance, we should remember two things: (1), that the commands of the Law respecting the Sabbath were very peremptory indeed, and were not abrogated, but rather enforced by many prophetical utterances; and (2), we are bound to remember that influential bodies of Christians, with the teaching of our Lord before them, and professing to receive the New Testament as their sole rule of faith, have gone as far as these Jews in binding the burden of the Jewish Sabbath upon Christians. Whilst we reprobate their malice, we must remember that as yet the Son of Man was not lifted up, and that after He was lifted up, very many who persecuted Him and crucified Him, "knew that it was He,"—knew that He was the Christ, the very Son of God. (John viii. 28.) God so ordered it that their conduct brings out with a power almost unique in Scripture, the Divine claims of the Eternal Son, which He now proceeds to assert.

17. "But Jesus answered them, My Father worketh hitherto,

17 ¶ But Jesus answered them, [g] My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.

18 Therefore the Jews [h] sought the more to kill

[g] ch. ix. 4. & xiv. 10.
[h] ch. vii. 19.

---

and I work." No words which Jesus had hitherto uttered asserted so unequivocally His Divine Power and Godhead as did these. For they imply, as the Jews understood them to imply, that God was His own Father; "His Father" in a way which no other being, human or angelic, shares with Him; His Father, not in the sense of having been created by Him, but in the sense of having been begotten of Him. And as a human father begets his equal, because he communicates to his son his own human nature as fully as it is possessed by himself; so the Eternal Father has communicated to His Son His own Divine Nature in its perfection, so that, as He works, the Son works. Christ here says, in effect: "My Father has to this day worked unceasingly on the Sabbath, in sustaining and upholding all things; and I work along with Him. As He, in innumerable instances, has terminated a disease on the Sabbath day, so can I, and so will I."

"For He all but wisheth to signify some such thing as this. If thou believest, O man, that God, having created and compacted all things by His command and will, ordereth the Creation on the Sabbath day also, so that the sun riseth, rain-giving fountains are let loose, and fruits spring from the earth, not refusing their increase by reason of the Sabbath, the fire works its own work, ministering to the necessities of man unforbidden: confess and know of a surety that the Father worketh God-befitting operations on the Sabbath also. Why, then, saith He, dost thou uninstructedly accuse Him through Whom He works all things? for God the Father will work in no other way, save through His Power and Wisdom, the Son. Therefore He and I work." (Cyril.)

18. "Therefore the Jews sought the more . . . equal with God." The omission of the translation of a very important word in the Greek of this verse [ἴδιος, *idios*, his own] in our Authorized Version is very unaccountable, seeing that in such a place as Rom. viii. 3 (God sending His own Son) it is correctly rendered as His own (or proper) Son: so here it ought to be His own or proper Father. The remark "making Himself equal with God" is the Evangelist's, and at once states the impression which the Jews received from the words

him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said

---

of Christ, and the truth of that impression. Thus Augustine: "So even the blind, even the slayers of Christ, yet understand the words of Christ. They did not understand Him to be Christ; they did not understand Him to be Son of God; but, for all that, they did understand in these words that such a Son of God was betokened as was equal with God. Who He was they knew not, yet that such an one was declared they knew at once, in that He said, 'God was His Father, making Himself equal with God.' Then was He not equal with God? It was not that He made Himself equal, but God had begotten Him equal."

It is necessary now to say something respecting the utterance of such words on the part of our Lord.

Humanly speaking, it seems impossible for those who heard them, whether disciples or enemies, to understand them. For it takes the whole Catholic Faith, which was not revealed till Pentecost, to understand them even in part For they imply that the God of Israel has a Son, Who can properly and literally be called His own Son, because begotten by Him, and not as created beings, who are by a figure called His sons, because made by Him or adopted by Him. In all this it is of necessity implied that this Eternal Father, in begetting His Son, derived to Him His whole Infinite Nature in all the fulness of its Divine Attributes, more particularly the attribute of power as exhibited in the ceaseless upholding of all things.

No living being at that time could understand this. To apprehend it requires not only Faith but Knowledge such as was not then given. Now this saying and what follows upon it takes its place amongst those sayings of Christ which this Gospel seems especially written to bring to memory: sayings which, as I said, had been heard by the Apostles, and had sunk into their minds, and through them had silently leavened the teaching of the Church. This saying of Christ, and this only, of those which have been preserved to us, is the ground for such words as we have in Coloss. i., "By him all things consist;" and in Hebrews i., "Upholding all things by the word of his power."

It seems natural that "the Word made Flesh" should speak sometimes as the "Word," not merely as the greatest of prophets, or the greatest of teachers, or even as the Messiah; but as "God

also that God was his Father, [1] making himself equal with God.

[1] ch. x. 30, 33. Phil. ii. 6.

18. "His Father;" rather, "His own Father," "His peculiar or proper Father" (ἴδιος).

manifest in the flesh:" speaking at such times not according to the knowledge of His creatures, but according to His own infinite knowledge, if for no other reason than for this, to show them what a heaven He lived in—how far above all thought were His relations to His Father, and to the Universe. This is one of such sayings; another I have noticed is, "If thou knewest the gift of God, and Who it is that saith to thee, Give me to drink, thou wouldest have asked of Him, and He would have given thee Living Water;" others are, "I am the living bread which came down from heaven;" "As the Father knoweth Me, and I know the Father;" "Before Abraham was, I am;" "I and the Father are one;" "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." Let anyone try to realize the amount of ignorance displayed even by Apostles before Pentecost, and then try to divest himself of the knowledge which he has derived from the Pauline Epistles, from St. John's Gospel and general Epistle, from the Creeds of the Church, from the writings of her Fathers and Doctors, and then say how he would have received such words from a man, perhaps much younger than himself, and having no recognized position whatsoever in the Theocracy.

I would remark, in passing, that sayings such as these must be THE Revelation—the special Revelation of any book in which they are, for the first time, made known: all other things which it teaches, or is supposed to teach, such as counter-developments of belief and unbelief in human beings, must be beyond measure subordinate to the making known of such sayings of Christ as these. In what, then, consisted the guilt of the Jews, in that they sought the more to slay him, because "He had not only broken the Sabbath, but said that God was his Father, making himself equal with God"? They were surely not bound to receive such claims by whomsoever asserted, and if they were faithful administrators of the Law of Moses, they were bound to prosecute blasphemy most severely. Their guilt was twofold: (1) they persisted in ignoring the miracles of Jesus, and (2) they shut their eyes to the force of Scriptures which clearly revealed that the Messiah, whom they then expected, would be a superhuman being. That their ignoring of His miracles arose from wilful and determined, and therefore sinful prejudice, is

19 Then answered Jesus and said unto them, Verily,

---

clear from the fact that one of the first amongst them came to Him, confessing on the part of others, besides himself, "We know that Thou art a teacher come from God, for no man can do these miracles that thou doest except God be with him;" and others could ask, "When Christ cometh, will He do more miracles than those which this man hath done?" And respecting the testimony of the older Scriptures to the Divine claims of the Messiah, had they not the Psalms, one of which spoke of Christ as God's begotten Son (Psalm ii.), and another as David's Son, and David's Lord (cx.); and Isaiah prophesying of the Messiah as "Wonderful, Councillor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace;" and Jeremiah, as "the Lord our Righteousness;" and Micah, as One Who, though born in Bethlehem, had His "goings forth from of old, of everlasting"? We have evidence that commentaries written before or about our Lord's time interpreted these places of the Messiah. So that if they were guided by their own Scriptures, they would have expected a Messiah very closely related to God.[1]

The Saviour now proceeds to soften, and yet to re-assert what he had said. He had spoken of the Father and the Son both working as if on an equality, now He proceeds to show that this does not imply two Gods, two independent Agents in upholding all things, but that He, as the Son of God, cannot work independently of, or apart from, His Father. It has been supposed that the following verses were spoken before a council of the Jewish rulers, who were seeking further ground of accusation against Him, implied in the words, "sought the more to slay Him," not by proceeding to apprehend Him at once, but by endeavouring to make Him commit Himself to something more definite on which they could lay hold.

19. "Then answered Jesus . . . . The Son can do nothing of Himself . . . . these also doeth the Son likewise." The Lord, therefore, meets them by disclaiming all independent or separate action; just as He Himself is "of" or "from" the Father, so all that He does, or says, is "of" or "from" the Father. Whatever

---

[1] The reader will find large extracts from Onkelos, Jonathan Ben Uzziel, and others, who were either contemporaries of our Lord, or sufficiently near to His time to show the opinions of the Rabbis, in "Selecta Targum" in Schaaf's "Opus Arumaum."

verily, I say unto you, [k] The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise.

[k] ver. 30. ch. viii. 28. & ix. 4. & xii. 49. & xiv. 10.

20 For [l] the Father loveth the Son, and

[l] Matt. iii. 17. ch. iii. 35. 2 Pet. i. 17.

---

19. "Likewise;" rather, "in like manner," "similarly;" Vulg., *similiter*.

He sees in the bosom of the Father, in the depths of the Divine counsels, that He does. What is inworking in the will and wisdom of the Father, that, so to speak, He works out.

We may illustrate this by a reference to creation. God made all things, and yet all things were made by the Word, for "without Him was not anything made that was made." This, of course, excludes the idea that God made some things, and the Logos others of a similar sort, and after a similar fashion of working; and shuts us up to the true meaning, that whatever was in the Divine foreknowledge and will, planned and determined on as to its existence and coming into being, that the Son worked out, so to speak, and gave shape to, as the Mediating Agent of His Father. And this consideration enables us to understand these words of the Son absolutely and universally, even with reference to those things which are peculiarly His work as the Incarnate Son, such as the accomplishment of our Redemption. These things considered as actually done by Himself, the Son cannot see the Father do; but all that He did and suffered in working out our Redemption was in the Divine Foreknowledge, Mind, Will, Wisdom, and Love. So that in redeeming us He did nothing but what He saw in the foreknowledge and will of the Father.

20. "The Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself doeth." Here we have the Lord still, in some measure, speaking after the manner of men, and using human illustrations to set forth the highest truths of God. Just as the obedient human son imitates what is done by his father, and being of the same nature does the same things in the same way; so the human father confides all to his son whom he loves, takes him into his whole counsel, hides nothing from him. Now the Lord implies that there is in the Divine Relationship between the Persons of the Godhead that which answers to this loving human relationship. As the Father knows the

sheweth him all things that himself doeth: and he will shew him greater works than these, that ye may marvel.

Son, so the Son knows the Father, so that all the counsels and thoughts of the Eternal Father are known to the Son, because of the perfect love wherewith They love one another. As between human souls which love there is no concealment, but one knows all that is in the heart of the other, so in the Trinity.

Now all this unfolding of the Divine Love in the Godhead, though expressed in human language, and after the manner of men, is absolutely true, because the human relationship of father and son is after the pattern of the Divine. If, in any case, it be not true of earthly fathers and earthly sons, it is because of the imperfection and sin of the human subjects which prevent the love and confidence which there is in the Persons sharing the Divine Nature.

This exhibition of the highest Divine things under the forms of the most familiar human attachment seems to have, for the time, disarmed the hostility of the Jews. They evidently did not know how to take it. They marvel and marvel again, but this they clearly saw, that whatever it meant, it asserted no independent will or action. It implied subordination to the Father, submission to His will, the carrying out of His purposes.

"He will shew him greater works than these, that ye may marvel." These greater works are the raising of the dead. It was a great thing to terminate in a moment a disease of thirty years' standing; but it would be a greater thing to terminate the reign of death in either the souls or the bodies of men. The latter, however, seems primarily to be alluded to because of the words, "that ye may marvel;" not, of course, stare in stupid wonder and pass on and think no more of it; but that they might marvel at the power which could raise a dead body to life, either in the case of Lazarus or His own, and this "marvelling" might make them ask themselves, How can such a man have such power? It must be from God "Who raiseth the dead," and must be a sign that He Who wields such power must come from God.

All Christ's mighty works were done that, in the first instance, men might "marvel"—*i.e.*, might be struck with them, and arrested by them, and so pass from simple astonishment to inquiry, and from inquiry to faith.

21 For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth *them*; [m] even so the Son quickeneth whom he will.

[m] Luke vii. 14 & viii. 54. ch. xi. 25, 43.

Verses 20, 21, 22, 23 are all inseparably connected. "The Father loveth the Son," and out of His love desires that He may receive the same honour from the universe of intelligences as He Himself does. To this end He will show Him greater works, even the greatest of all, the Resurrection of the Dead, which power of raising the dead (implied in God showing it to Him) was given to the Son that He might exercise that Universal Judgment which can only take place in consequence of all men being raised again in their bodies, and this for the further purpose that He may receive that highest Divine Honour which is due to Him as Supreme Judge, the glory of assigning to men and angels their eternal reward, so that ultimately all glory might be to the Father, in that He had an only Son Whom He so loved as to show Him all things that He Himself did.

The honour of the Father is that He should have a Son so fully partaking of His own wisdom and power that He can commit to that Son the conduct of the Universal Judgment.

21. "For as the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them," &c. To what instances of the Father's raising the dead does the Son here allude? There are two or three such resurrections recorded in the Old Testament, and there may have been many of which the record has not been preserved to us, but it may be that the Lord means the power which is inherent in the Father, even though it be not exercised, or exercised only through the Son.

"Even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." "Even so," *i.e.*, in like manner, as the Father raiseth and quickeneth: not as the mere Delegate or Representative of God, but as having within Him Life in Himself. The raising of the dead by the Son will not be by the invocation of the power of the Father, but by the communication of His own Life. "Whom he will." This seems to mean that the power of the Son is absolutely unrestricted except by that "will" which necessarily directs the working of all intelligences. All whom He "wills" to quicken He can and He does quicken. If any one is unquickened, it is because in His infinite wisdom (and perhaps mercy) He wills it not. He exercised this will when He restored to health one man only at the pool, and left the rest unhealed. He

n Matt. xi. 27. & xxviii. 18. ver. 27. ch. iii. 35. & xvii. 2. Acts xvii. 31. 1 Pet. iv. 5.

22 For the Father judgeth no man, but n hath committed all judgment unto the Son:

23 That all *men* should honour the Son, even

22. "For the Father judgeth no man." rather, "Neither doth the Father judge." Alford and Revisers. *Neque enim Pater judicat quemquam* (Vulg.).

exercised the same will when out of the multitudes of Jews who died whilst He lived among them, He raised only a few—the names of three only are recorded. But if we are tempted to suppose that this will of His is independent of the Father, we are met by His words in the next chapter: "This is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which He hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day." (vi. 39.)

22. "For the Father judgeth no man." This "judgeth," of course, means publicly before the universe at the great day: for it is the inalienable prerogative of every intelligent being to judge all characters and actions that come before him, and class them as good or bad.

"Hath committed all judgment." All judgment now and hereafter. There is a never-ceasing judgment going on now upon every person, whether he is fitted to receive a higher degree of Life or Grace, or whether, through his misuse of it, that which he hath is to be taken away; and this perpetual exercise of judgment which is now for the most part secret, will issue in a final judgment, which will take place before the universe, and which will be conducted, not by the Father, but by the Son. The Father will then judge, but He will judge the world in righteousness *by that Man Whom He hath chosen*. "As God the Father, having the power to create, createth all things through the Son, as through His Own Power and Might: so having the Power to judge, He will work this too through the Son as His own Righteousness." (Cyril.)

23. "That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father." The supreme honour due to God, than which nothing can be conceived greater, is the honour due to Him and paid to Him as the Righteous Ruler of all created intelligences. This is greater than the honour due to Him as the Creator, for it takes into account His hatred of and opposition to that evil which has (we know not how) got into the universe.

But this righteous government implies judgment, both present and final: present, because the present government of all intel

as they honour the Father. [o] He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father which hath sent him.

[o] 1 John ii. 23.

24 Verily, verily, I say unto you, [p] He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent

[p] ch. iii. 16, 18. & vi. 40, 47. & viii. 51. & xx 31.

24. "Believeth on Him;" rather, "believeth Him." *Et credit ei qui misit me.* But see below.

ligent beings implies a continued taking account of their actions: and final, in order to redress the patent inequalities of the present distribution of happiness.

Now, if the Son, by the Omniscience and Omnipotence inherent in Him, exercises this judgment, He must of necessity receive the highest honour due to God; for no glory can be conceived greater than that a Divine Person should righteously and yet mercifully award to each and every intelligent being his final state.

This equality of honour with the Father thus paid to the Son, of course carries with it all other expressions of honour, such as Divine worship; and so we find the hosts of heaven singing "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom," and again, "Blessing, and glory, and honour, and power be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever." (Rev. v. 12, 13).

"He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father which hath sent him." It is the greatest glory of God to have a Son by Whom He created the worlds, and to Whom He has committed His highest prerogative of judgment. The Arian idea that Christ is a very glorious, but created Being, does away with the honour of the real Fatherhood of God. This is admirably put by Augustine. "If thou didst not yet honour the Son, neither didst thou honour the Father. For what honouring of the Father can there be, unless for that He hath a *Son?* It is one thing, when thou art bidden to think of God in that He is 'God,' and another thing when thou art bidden to think of God in that He is 'Father.' When thou art bidden to think that He is God, it is to think of the Creator, to think of One Almighty, to think of a Spirit Supreme, Eternal, Invisible, Unchangeable; but when thou art bidden to think that He is *Father*, it cannot be but thou art bidden to think of a *Son* also, because one cannot be called father if he have not a son, as neither son unless he have a father."

24. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word,

me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemna-

24. "Shall not come;" rather, "cometh not."
"Condemnation;" rendered by some, "judgment." See below.

and believeth," &c. He that heareth my word—hears it with hearing ears. "Blessed are your ears, for they hear." He that heareth it so as to receive it into the heart, "and believeth on Him that sent Me." The ultimate object of all faith is God the Father, but God the Father, not as the Supreme Being, or the Creator; but as the Father Who has one Son Whom He sent into the world through the Humiliation of the Incarnation to lay down His Life, and to take it again. Thus the Apostle: "To us righteousness shall be imputed, if we believe on Him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead" (Rom. iv. 24); and again, "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." (Rom. x. 9.)

No distinction can be made here between "believing Him that sent Me," and "believing *on* Him that sent Me;" for this reason, that the word or message has as its very substratum the Person of the Sender and the Person of the Sent as Father and Son. Christ's message is not concerning abstractions, as Virtue or Wisdom, or even Love, but concerning the Father ["I have declared unto them Thy Name," John xvii. 26], and the Father's witness to Christ, which all have first of all to believe, is that He is His real, true, and only Son. So that if we believe Him that sent Him, we believe on Him that sent Him; for the Person of the Father as Father, and so the Sender, and the Person of the Son as the Son, and so sent by Him, is that without which the word or message has no existence; then comes, of course, the Motive of the Sender of the Son [His love "God so loved the world" &c.], and the way in which He sent Him, and the purposes for which He sent Him. All this makes the believing the Divine Person, and the believing *in* Him, to be in this case inseparable, and in point of fact, undistinguishable.

"Hath everlasting life." Not hereafter only, but here. "The life which I live in the Flesh, I live by the Faith of the Son of God." "Christ, Who is our Life."

"And shall not come into condemnation." I am compelled, on account of the supreme importance of the subject, to repeat to a certain extent here what I said on chapter iii. 18. For the same

tion; [q] but is passed from death unto life.

[q] 1 John iii. 14.

---

mischievous alteration is made here, not only by the Revisers, but by some leading commentators. I mean the substitution of the word "judgment" for "condemnation." "He that heareth my word, shall not come into judgment." One commentator, and that one of the most able, writes: "The believer has passed into a state to which judgment does not apply;" but if so, as I have shown, he is no longer under the moral government of God. God, if He is not to judge him, must look with perfect indifference on his actions. Now, I earnestly desire any person who may read what I am now writing, to think of the religious or "believing" men and women whom he has known in times past—persons who would not be what they are unless they had had some life from God vouchsafed to them, and then say whether, if God have any care respecting the use men make of His gifts, such persons must not be judged by Him. They must be judged, if "every man is to receive his own reward, according to his own labour." (1 Cor. iii. 8.) They must be judged, if such a believer as St. Paul says of himself, "We must all appear [or "be made manifest," which is still more searching] before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body." (2 Cor. v. 10.) The receiving of life, so far from setting a man above the sphere of judgment, will subject him to a more searching process, according to what our Lord says "Every branch in me that beareth not fruit, He taketh away." (John xv.) All the truth respecting this matter is preserved by the old translation, which renders the word *krisis*, or judgment, as it is frequently used in the New Testament, as judgment issuing in condemnation and punishment.[1]

I cannot see how the Revisers, and those who uphold their rendering, can say with sincerity the article of the Creed, "From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead."

This distinction between judgment and condemnation is admirably put by Augustine, "The Lord our God therefore revealeth, and by His Scripture admonisheth us, how it is to be understood when judgment is spoken of. I exhort you, then, that ye attend.

---

[1] Thus Matth. xxiii. 33; Mark iii. 29 (most probable reading); John xvi. 11; 1 Tim. v. 24; Heb. x. 27; James ii. 13; Rev. xiv. 7.

25 Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when [r] the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live.

r ver. 28. Eph. ii. 1, 5. & v. 14. Col. ii. 13.

Sometimes judgment means punishment; sometimes judgment means discrimination. According to that sense in which judgment means discrimination, we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that there a man may receive what he hath done in the body, whether it be good or ill; for this is discrimination, that there be a distribution of good to good, evil to evil. . . . But in respect of the judgment of condemnation, 'Whoso heareth my word,' saith Christ, 'and believeth on Him that sent Me, hath eternal life, and shall not come into judgment, but passeth from death unto life.' What is *shall not come into judgment?* Shall not come into condemnation." (Augustine, *in loco.*)

Also by Stier, amongst modern writers. "The dead live in the full meaning of the word, having, even now, eternal life; and they come not into the judgment of condemnation, but ever stand in the judgment of the Son of Man, in the full meaning of *that* word; that is, under the judgment of His mercy and grace."

25-29. In the next five verses the Lord expands the truths contained in the twenty-fourth. In verse 24 He had said, "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life." This He expands into, "The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live." This is the Resurrection respecting which we pray, "We meekly beseech Thee, O Father, to raise us from the death of sin unto the life of righteousness."

That this Resurrection from spiritual death to spiritual life is meant here, is manifest from the words, "and now is." But how is it that the Lord mentions both the future and the present, and the future first? It is because the voice of the Son of God came in fulness of power at the day of Pentecost. Then, as never before in this world, the dead heard the voice of the Son of God. His voice was then heard in the voice of His servants, according to His words, "He that heareth you, heareth me," but before the Resurrection and the Pentecostal outpouring there were many first fruits. Such were the Apostles, and the numbers who in Galilee, and even in Jerusalem, believed because of His word.

"They that hear shall live." Shall live with the life of the

26 For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself;

27 And [s] hath given him authority to execute judgment also, [t] because he is the Son of man.

[s] ver. 22. Acts x. 42. & xvii. 31.
[t] Dan. vii. 13, 14.

27. "Also" omitted by ℵ, A., B., L., 33, some old Latin MSS. (b, c, d, e, ff², l), Curetonian Syriac, Copt., Arm., Æth.; retained by D., later Uncials, and almost all Cursives. Vulg. (Cod. Amiat.), and Peshito Syriac.

Son of God. The description of this life we have in Acts ii. 37-47, "They were pricked to the heart, they were baptized, they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine, and in their fellowship, and in the breaking of bread, and in the prayers; the true fear of God rested on all of them, they esteemed nothing which they possessed as their own, they continued daily in the temple, they brake bread in their own assemblies, they eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God." Such was the first life of the Church. Not only sincere, earnest, spiritual; but corporate, sacramental, charitable. Its fruits have never been equalled since.

26. "For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." By begetting Him He communicated to Him His own Divine Life. Not so with created beings: they have life, not in themselves, but in God, so long as God wills to keep it in being by means suited to sustain life, such as food and health, and in that higher degree of life called spiritual life, by the Word and Sacraments. This life is not strictly their own, whereas God has communicated to His Son His own self-existent eternal Life; just as a human being communicates to his son his own temporal, transitory, dependent life. This Life which is inherent in Him as God is communicated to His Manhood also, which Manhood is now inseparable from His Godhead; and so He says in the next chapter, "I am the living bread which came down from heaven." The Life of God which is now in the Christian is the Life of the Son of God. The raising up of the spiritually dead of verse 25 is the effect of the Son of God having Life in Himself, as the verses are connected by "for."

27. "And hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the [or a] Son of man." The reason which is implied in the word "because" may be one of two. It may be, that being Son of man, it is necessary that authority to judge all men should be specially committed to Him, because it is not the prerogative of

28 Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice,

---

any "son of man" to judge finally. God as God is the Judge of all, but God wills to judge the world by a man [that Man Whom He hath chosen], and so He formally commits to Him as man the authority to judge. But the word "because" (ὅτι) may refer to the fitness which He has as man, and so one of themselves, to judge mankind. It is the intention of God to judge men by One Who has had experience of their state, Who, by belonging to their race, is identified with them, Who will judge them [just as He mediates for them] as One Who has a feeling for their infirmities and was "in all points tempted like as they are, yet without sin." "No stranger shall judge us, but He Who is our Fellow, Who will sustain our interests, and have full sympathy in all our imperfections. He Who loved us, even to die for us, is graciously appointed to assign the final measurement and price upon His own work. He Who best knows by infirmity to take the part of the infirm, He Who would fain reap the full fruit of His Passion, He will separate the wheat from the chaff, so that not a grain shall fall to the ground. He Who has given us to share His own spiritual nature; He from Whom we have drawn the life-blood of our souls, He, our Brother, will decide about His brethren. In that His Second Coming may He in His grace and loving pity remember us, Who is our only Hope, our only Salvation." (J. H. Newman, "Parochial Sermons," vol. ii., "Sermon on Christmas Day.")

28. "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, &c." The Lord sees the astonishment with which they receive His words: but instead of softening them He proceeds to show how, at the last, He will execute His judgment. It will not take place immediately after death in the separate state, not secretly, not in camerâ as it were; neither will it take place by some imaginary self-executing law, as when men, on account of evil conduct, naturally lose honour and self-respect, or have their lives rendered painful, or shortened, by profligacy or excess; neither will it be by some slow process of providence by which a man, in after life, is made to feel, by the way in which men treat him, the cruelty with which he once treated his brethren. (Gen. xlii. 21.) No, it will be by the visible interposition of God, after the manner of an assize; all nations at once summoned before the Son of Man.

29 [u] And shall come forth; [x] they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.

[u] Is. xxvi. 19. 1 Cor. xv. 52. 1 Thess. iv. 16.
[x] Dan. xii. 2. Matt. xxv. 32, 33, 46.

29. "Damnation." Same word as is elsewhere translated "judgment." It must of necessity here mean "condemnation."

All Scripture witnesses respecting this judgment that all men, believers and unbelievers, even Apostles, will be subject to it—all believers, because there is the greatest difference between some believers and others, some showing their faith by the most abundant good works, others by the scantiest, and so some have an abundant entrance, and some are saved as by fire. (2 Pet. i. 11, 1 Cor. iii. 15.)

Here, however, the Universal Judgment is brought in, not merely to assert it or re-assert it; but to affirm that it will follow upon a general Resurrection, the voice of the Son of Man penetrating into every grave, and every tenant of every grave coming forth when he hears it.

29. "They that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." Let the reader notice how the description of the final judgment here is in accord with every other in the Bible on one point of supreme importance, which is, that the division will not be into "believers" and "unbelievers," much less will it be a judgment on unbelievers only, to condemn them all to destruction, which it must be if believers are exempt from it; but the division is into "those that have done good" and "those that have done evil." So in Acts xxiv. 15, it is into "the just and the unjust;" in Matth. xiii. 49, into the "wicked" and the "just;" in Matth. xxv. into those who have done works of mercy, and those who have not; in Rom. ii. into those who "by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory, honour, and immortality," and those "who are contentious and obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness." This place (John v. 29) seems the most pronounced of all, for having laid down that through hearing and believing men have (now) eternal life, instead of leading us to believe that this eternal life puts a believer above judgment, the Lord makes the man's title to eternal life the fact of his having done good. It is astonishing that there can be a difference of opinion among Christian people about this

30 [y] I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because [z] I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me.

y ver. 19.
z Matt. xxvi. 39. ch. iv. 34. & vi. 38.

31 [a] If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true.

a See ch. viii. 14. Rev. iii. 14.

30. "Of the Father." ℵ, A., B., D., K., L., Δ, Λ, Π, some twelve Cursives, some old Latin (a, e, f, ff², g, l, q), Vulg., read "Him that sent me;" but a few Uncials, E., G., H., M., and most Cursives, read "the Father that sent me."

matter. It seems placed beyond all dispute by Christ Himself that the title to blessedness is not life, but the use made of it; not faith, but the fruits of faith in "patient continuance in well-doing."

30. "I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge." Here the Lord re-asserts the absolute unity of mind and will in Himself and His Father. As the Father creates nothing, upholds nothing, judges no one but by His Son, so the Son, being a perfect Son, perfectly obedient to His Father, and perfectly loving Him, can do nothing without His Father. This place is in all respects correspondent to verse 19. As the teaching of verse 19, "I can of mine own self do nothing," explains, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work," so as to show the Jews that He meant no working apart from the Father; so this verse 30 is to be taken as similarly explaining the assertions of verses 27, 28, and 29. "As I do nothing without or apart from the Father, so I judge no man independently of or apart from the Father. As I work what I see the Father work, so I judge according to what I see and hear in the mind of the Father."

"My judgment is just: because I seek not mine own will, but the will," &c. If a judge seek his own will, *i.e.*, his own purpose, his own glory, his own ends, his judgment cannot be just. It can only be just if he has a single eye to the interests of righteousness and truth; and so the Son, in judging, seeks not His own Will, but the Will of Eternal Righteousness and Truth, even the Father, Whose righteous decision in the Councils of the Godhead He "hears." In seeking His Father's Will He is seeking the perfection of Righteousness.

31. "If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true." "If such a thing were conceivable that I should claim to do what I do independently, so as to make myself to be a second and separate

32 ¶ [b] There is another that beareth witness of me; and I know that the witness which he witnesseth of me is true.

[b] Matt. iii. 17. & xvii. 5. ch. viii. 18. 1 John v. 6, 7, 9.

God, then My witness would not be true." The Lord now proceeds to assert that respecting His witness which He had asserted respecting His works and His judgment. Just as in His works He did nothing of Himself apart from His Father, just as in His judging He judges nothing of Himself apart from His Father; so in the matter of witness He bore not testimony to Himself, because all His witness witnessed to the greater glory of the Father. In no sense did He assert His own independence: He Himself was "of the Father," His works were "of the Father." (John xiv. 10.) His judgment was "of the Father." If any were saved it was not merely by hearing His Word, but by "believing on Him that sent Him," *i.e.*, on the Father: so that in seeming to witness to Himself, the Lord Jesus really witnessed to the Father. If He asserted His own power, His own Wisdom, His own Life, His own Judgment, it was that in Him was seen the Power, Wisdom, Life, Judgment of the Father. The very word that He used respecting Himself, the word *Son*, as He used it, of necessity led men up to the Father.

And as His witness ultimately centred in the Person of Another, so that Other, the Father, bore witness to Him.

32. "There is another that beareth witness of me; and I know that the witness," &c. Now in order reverently to enter into and realize the position of our Lord as regards His Father on the one hand, and the Jews on the other, we are to remember that the whole Theocracy to which He and the Jews belonged, from first to last rested on the witness of God to Himself as the God of Abraham, by miracles, signs, and wonders. Who was the God in Whom the Jews believed? Not the God of mere Nature, the Giver of the rain and fruitful seasons: not a God the idea of Whom rested on Natural Theology or Philosophy, but the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the God Who sent Moses, raised up the Judges and Samuel, made David a king, worked wonders through Elijah and Elisha, and inspired Isaiah and the rest of the Prophets.

We must remember that if these men witnessed to the God of Abraham as the true God, it was because God accredited their witness by the works which He did by them. And if He witnessed to His message in Gideon, Samuel, Elijah, and Elisha, much more in

33 Ye sent unto John, [c] and he bare witness unto the truth.

[c] ch. i. 15, 19, 27, 32.

34 But I receive not testimony from man: but these things I say, that ye might be saved.

34. "From man;" perhaps "from a man."

the Man then before them. We must remember that the sole reason for their believing that the God of the Patriarchs was their God was the Supernatural in their history, so that on their own principles it was absurd to receive the testimony to Elijah, and to deny the witness to Jesus.

"I know that the witness which he witnesseth of me is true." Here the Lord seems to say, "He by His works wrought by Me, by the testimony of the Baptist, and in His scriptures, witnesseth very great things of Me, that I am His Very Son; but I know, I am conscious in Myself, that, great though they seem, they are true."

33. "Ye sent unto John, and he bare witness unto the truth." "Ye sent unto John, ye know that his holiness and self-denying life, and the success of his preaching in turning the worst sinners to repentance, showed that he was sent of God. Your sending to him was a proof that you felt the truth of his mission, and that "he bare witness unto the truth." He bare witness to you that his eyes saw the sign which God had promised him, the Holy Ghost descending and lighting upon Me, and from this he bare record to you that I am the Son of God."

34. "But I receive not testimony from man." This arises from the nature of the thing to which testimony is borne. "I have been telling you the deepest things respecting the relation that there is between Me and My Father, as Father and Son, and no created being can really testify to such things; only the Father and Myself and the Holy Spirit know these things as they are."

The words, "I receive not testimony from man," cannot, of course, mean "I reject the testimony of John to Myself, or even disparage it;" but they are to be understood in the light of the thirty-sixth verse, "I have greater witness than John." "The testimony of John ought to have been sufficient for you. He was the 'burning' and the 'shining light,' and ye acknowledged him to be such, for 'ye were willing for a season to rejoice in his light;' but no man can bear adequate testimony to Me and My claims. God alone is My true and abiding Witness, and He witnesses by the

35 He was a burning and [d] a shining light: and [e] ye were willing for a season to rejoice in his light.

36 ¶ But [f] I have greater witness than *that* of John: for [g] the works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me.

[d] 2 Pet. i. 19.
[e] See Matt. xiii. 20. & xxi. 26. Mark vi. 20.
[f] 1 John v. 9.
[g] ch. iii. 2. & x. 25. & xv. 24.

---

35. "He was the burning and the shining light." Article to be expressed.

works which He has given Me to do, in comparison with which the witness of John is as nothing." How, then, come in the words, "These things I say, that ye might be saved"? Evidently in some such way as this: "Though the Father alone beareth true and sufficient witness of Me, yet the Father sent John to prepare the way for Me; His light shone in John, ye acknowledged him, and I now speak of John and remind you of him, imperfect though his witness was, that ye may be saved." Chrysostom seems to have apprehended exactly the drift of these somewhat difficult words. "What He saith is of this kind, 'I, being God, needed not the witness of John, which is man's witness, yet because ye gave more heed to him, believed him more trustworthy than any, ran to him as a prophet (for all the city was poured forth to Jordan), and have not believed on Me even when working miracles, therefore I remind you of that witness of his.'"

35. "He was a [the] burning and a [the] shining light." Many commentators read in this a tone of disparagement; the Baptist was a lighted light, and so gave not light of himself, but was lighted and shone with a borrowed light, a light not essentially his own. But is not this the case with every servant of God? The words seem rather to exalt the light, as not only very bright, but also as taking away all excuse from the Jews in not accepting his witness to Jesus.

"Ye were willing for a season to rejoice in his light." We read in confirmation of this that "all men mused of John whether he were the Christ or no." (Luke iii. 15.) Even the Jews, *i.e.*, the Sanhedrim, sent priests and Levites to inquire whether he were the Christ. No prophet of God seems to have stirred the better feelings of the nation as he did. "There went out to him Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan."

36. "But I have greater witness than that of John," &c. The article should be expressed, "I have the witness greater than John,"

37 And the Father himself, which hath sent me, [h] hath borne witness of me. Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, [i] nor seen his shape.

38 And ye have not his word abiding in you: for whom he hath sent, him ye believe not.

[h] Matt. iii. 17. & xvii. 5. ch. vi. 27. & viii. 18.

[i] Deut. iv. 12. ch. i. 18. 1 Tim. i. 17. 1 John iv. 12.

---

not than *that* of John, but than John himself. "The works which my Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do bear witness of me," &c. The reasoning of this seems best explained by a reference to John x. 37, "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not." Again, xiv. 10, "The Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works." The "works" here must not be restricted to miracles, but must include all the successive stages of the great Redemptive Work. All these bore ever-increasing witness. As the claims of Christ on men's faith and love increased, so the works which bore witness to Him increased in significance, till they culminated in His own Resurrection and Ascension, and the gift of the Holy Ghost.

37. "And the Father himself, which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me." In the verses before this the Saviour had used the present tense, "the works which I do bear witness." Now He speaks of a more direct witness, and also one that was accomplished in past time. "The Father himself, which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me." What is the nature of *this* witness? In verses 37 and 38 three ways are mentioned in which it is possible, or it might be conceived, that God might bear witness to men: He might be heard of them ("they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden"); He might be seen of them, as He was by Moses; or He might manifest Himself by His Word "dwelling in them," and so spiritually and effectually instructing them in what He would have them know and do. In none of these three ways were the Jews cognizant of the witness of God. They had neither seen Him nor heard Him, nor was He revealed to them by His Word abiding in them; but, notwithstanding this, He had, in a most direct and effectual way, witnessed to them of His Son. This was in the Holy Scriptures, which the Jews so idolized. If they understood their own Scriptures aright, they would find that they were full of one hope, "the testimony of Jesus was the spirit of prophecy."

39 ¶ [k] Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and [l] they are they which testify of me.

40 [m] And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life.

k Is. xii. 20. & xxxiv. 16. Luke xvi. 29. ver. 46. Acts xvii. 11.
l Dent. xviii. 15, 18. Luke xxiv. 27. ch. i. 45.
m ch. i. 11. & iii. 19.

39. "Search the scriptures;" or, "Ye search the scriptures." The word may be translated either way.

40. "And ye will not come;" rather, "And ye desire not to come to me."

39. "Ye search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me." "Ye desire some evidence that ye shall live after death, that ye shall rise again, that ye shall enjoy eternal life. Well, the doctrine of Eternal Life is to be found in these Scriptures, but it is to be found in close connection with their witness to Me. Ye *think* that ye have eternal life in them, but ye might be sure that ye have in them the promise of a supernatural Messiah, Who is the Son of God." The words, "Ye search . . . because ye *think* ye *have*," cannot but imply that the doctrine of immortality, though contained in the Old Testament scriptures, was not on their surface, as it is in the New Testament, but that the doctrine of a supra-human Messiah was much more plainly revealed in them, and was on their surface.

To return to verse 38, "Ye have not his word abiding in you, for whom he hath," &c. There is the closest connection between the Word of God abiding *in* a man, and that man's reception of any *outward* messenger, or providence, or dispensation, which God may send; according to our Lord's own words, "He that is of the truth cometh to the light," "He that is of God heareth God's words," "Every one that hath heard and hath learned of the Father cometh unto me."

"Search the scriptures," or "ye search the Scriptures." The verb may be either in the indicative or the imperative mood. Taken either way, the place shows us that men may be very busy about the Scriptures, read them very critically, carefully count the verses, words, letters, as the Jews did, and yet miss the chief treasure contained in them, the knowledge of the Son of God.

40. "And ye will not come unto me, that ye might have life."

41 [a] I receive not honour from men.

[a] ver. 34.
1 Thess. ii. 6.

42 But I know you, that ye have not the love of God in you.

The only probable connection between this verse and the last is to be obtained by understanding the word "yet," which also seems to be implied in the copulative with which the verse begins: "And *yet*, notwithstanding your searching the Scriptures, which Scriptures so plainly testify to Me, ye will not, ye desire not to come to Me, that ye might have life."

41-44. The connection between these verses is very difficult to explain. Scarcely one commentator agrees with another upon their real drift. It seems to be something of this sort: the words, "I receive not honour from men," correspond to "I am come in my Father's name" of verse 43. If a man comes in his own name, he naturally strives to attract regard to himself for his own sake, his coming in his own name signifying, necessarily, that he comes on his own account. If a man comes in another's name, if he is loyal and true, he seeks the honour that comes from that other one in whose name he comes, and desires to honour him. Now so it was with the Lord Jesus. He received not glory from men, *i.e.*, He did not desire it, or lay Himself out for it; He preferred rather, in order to carry out the purposes of Him Who sent Him, to be "despised and rejected of men," and this because He loved God supremely. Why, then, was He rejected? For the very reason that, because He loved God, and sought His glory alone, there was no community of feeling between Him and His opposers. "I know *you*," he says, –you before me,—"that ye have not the love of God in you," and so ye are disinclined to receive One Who comes only in God's Name. "If another shall come in his own name," making himself out for his own worldly, selfish ends to be some great one, "him ye will receive." If I were to put Myself forward to be your king for My own ends, then ye would receive Me. And all this, the Lord intimates, is natural. "How can ye, how are ye able to believe who receive honour one of another, and seek not the honour that cometh from God alone? If ye lay yourselves out to receive the applause of men, and are indifferent to the honour that cometh from God, by so doing ye show that ye love the world rather than God; and so ye will not receive One Who comes in God's

43 I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not: if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive.

44 [o] How can ye believe, which receive honour one of another, and seek not [p] the honour that *cometh* from God only?

[o] ch. xii. 43.
[p] Rom. ii. 29.

---

44. "From God only;" perhaps, "From the only God;" or, according to B. and the oldest Latin, "the only one."

Name to overcome the world, and establish in each soul the supreme love of God."

"All belief in Me, such as God demands from you, is moral. It is the soul stretching forth and coming out of itself to receive and embrace that which comes from God to cleanse it, and free it, and raise it up to God. I come from God for this purpose, and for no low and carnal purpose whatsoever, and ye do not receive Me, because ye do not desire to be cleansed and made free and raised up to God."

Such seems to be the thread of connection between these verses taken together, and they can hardly be taken separately. Each of them, however, may be taken by itself so far as to teach a particular axiom of Divine Wisdom.

40. "Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life." There is an implied invitation in this, echoing that of the Synoptic "Come unto Me, all ye." If men are unholy and worldly, *i.e.*, are spiritually dead, it is because of their wills which are set upon remaining as they are, and so desire not to come to the Restorer of Life for His Life.

41. "I receive not honour from men . . . ye have not the love of God in you." According to the Saviour, then, the opposite to receiving (that is, desiring to receive) honour from men is having the love of God. The form of worldliness which is most opposed to the honour and so to the love of God, is desire of the applause of men. The Son of God whilst on earth received from men, not honour, but opposition, contumely, unbelief, persecution, and at last death, and in no respect declined these evil things, and this because He knew that in the Divine Counsels men could not otherwise be redeemed.

43. "I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not: if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive." This does not merely apply to the Jews, who were seduced by such impostors

45 Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father
q Rom. ii. 12. q there is *one* that accuseth you, *even* Moses, in whom ye trust.

---

as Barchochabas, but it is true of human nature in all time "Truth," as has been well said, "is never received, *i.e.*, really and savingly received, on a large scale." Jesus was not received because He taught the whole truth of God; because He exhibited in Himself, and demanded of men, the holiness of God; because He made no compromise with any evil whatsoever. This was, indeed, coming in the Name of God, and they received Him not.

"If another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive." Does this refer to the sixty-four false Christs which some learned men have enumerated as having deluded the Jews? It certainly seems that having rejected the true Christ, they were given up to receive false Christs. Many, and I think with great probability, interpret it as referring to the Antichrist. Thus Stier: "The other in the singular [If another shall come in his own name] . . . is finally, Antichrist with his open and avowed denial of God and of Christ, with his most daring 'I,' before which all the proud will humbly bow down, because they will find themselves again in him and honour him as their true God. As the Father reveals Himself in Christ, so will Satan manifest himself in him, and give him all his work and witness, his own honour as the prince of this world; and the wicked will yield themselves to him because, through unbelief, they have already fallen into his nature and fitly belong to him."

45. "Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father." "So far from coming to accuse you, I am come to give you life. So far from binding your sins upon you, I shall die to loose them and reconcile you to God. I rebuke that which I read in your hearts, but all this I do, not for your condemnation, but for your salvation."

"There is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust." "Moses, for whose law in its mere letter ye are so zealous, now accuseth you, for his words, in which you boast yourselves, condemn you. The Law was given by him to convince you of sin. You dishonour his Law, and destroy its sin-convincing power by your traditions."

46. "For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me." The promise to Adam and Eve on their fall, the

46 For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: [r] for he wrote of me.

47 But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?

r Gen. iii. 15. & xii. 3. & xviii. 18. & xxii. 18. & xlix. 10. Deut. xviii. 15, 18. ch. i. 45. Acts xxvi. 22.

46. "For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me;" rather, "If ye believed Moses ye would believe me;" implying that it was still in their power to do so.

promise to the Patriarchs, the Mediating Angel, the prophecy of "One like to Moses"—all these witnessed to Christ; and besides there were those who took up and followed out the teaching of Moses, such as the Psalmists, the Prophets, and the Proverb writers: all these are at times called "the Law." (John x. 34, Rom. iii. 10-20.) And from many intimations in Scripture we have every reasons to believe that the references which the Jewish teachers found to the Messiah in the Old Testament were far more numerous than those which, under the influence of a cold and narrowing criticism, we now find.

47. "If ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" How strange must this have sounded in the ears of men whose passion it was to glory in the Scriptures! And yet the only *believing* in Scripture worth speaking of must be *receiving* it for the purposes for which God caused it to be written. God had so inspired the Scriptures, especially the books of Moses, that they would lead those who truly believed them to accept His Son. Their belief in the writings of Moses was the God-ordained step to their belief in Christ. If they believed not in the Son of God, it was a sign that they had not truly taken this step—that they had not truly submitted to the preparation which God had ordained.

CHAP. VI.

AFTER [a] these things Jesus went over the sea of Galilee, which is *the sea* of Tiberias.

[a] Matt. xiv. 15. Mark vi. 35. Luke ix. 10, 12.

2 And a great multitude followed him, because they saw his miracles which he did on them that were diseased.

3 And Jesus went up into a mountain, and there he sat with his disciples.

---

2. "Miracles." *Signa*, Vulg.; "signs," Revised.

3. "A mountain." Literally, "*the* mountain"—some well-known hill—perhaps "the hilly country."

1. "After these things Jesus went over the sea of Galilee," &c. This does not mean that the Lord went direct from Jerusalem, the scene of the last miracle, to the other side of the lake, but it simply expresses that the two miracles about to be recorded, and the discourse which followed on them, took place after what was mentioned in Chapter V., but after how long or how short a time is not indicated in this Gospel, though we learn from the Synoptics that there was a considerable interval of active ministry between the time of the discourse of the last chapter, and the miracle with which this begins.

"Which is the sea of Tiberias." Tiberias being a Gentile name would be better known in Ephesus, where this Gospel was probably written.

2. "And a great multitude followed him, because they saw his miracles," &c. This is inserted by the Evangelist to account for the presence of five thousand men in a place where there were no provisions. We need not, then, resort to the supposition that they were on their way to Jerusalem to keep the Passover.

3. "And Jesus went up into a mountain, and there he sat with his disciples." Perhaps this was for the retirement and refreshment so needed by them [see St. Mark vi. 31].

4 [b] And the passover, a feast of the Jews, was nigh.

5 ¶ [c] When Jesus then lifted up *his* eyes, and saw a great company come unto him, he saith unto Philip, Whence shall we buy bread, that these may eat?

[b] Lev. xxiii. 5, 7. Deut. xvi. 1. ch. ii. 13. & v. 1.

[c] Matt. xiv. 14. Mark vi. 35. Luke ix. 12.

---

4. "The Passover." There is no difference of reading as regards this word in any Manuscript or Version, but in Westcott and Hort's "Appendix on Select Readings" there is a long and interesting note on the word being a possible interpolation. It ends with the following observation:—"As a considerable body of Patristic evidence points to the absence of the words in at least some ancient texts, and internal evidence is unfavourable to their genuineness, while the chronology of the Gospel History is fundamentally affected by their presence or absence, it seems right to express suspicion and to justify it at some length."

4. "And the passover, a feast of the Jews, was nigh." Why does St. John bring in the Passover here? Most commentators, even many who see no reference to the Christian Passover in this chapter, seem led to suppose that in some way it bears on the interpretation of the following discourse. It seems thrown in by the Evangelist, because he could not but connect together such things as Christ feeding men with bread—then setting Himself forth as the true Bread—then at the last Passover giving Himself as food, and also surrendering Himself as the Passover Victim. Thus one writes, "The notice of the feast is probably designed to give a clue to the understanding of the spiritual lessons of the miracle, which are set forth in the discourse which followed (1 Cor. v. 7);" and another, "The miracle and the discourse alike relate to the true Passover."

The two miracles which follow are the only ones common to St. John and the Synoptics. They are introduced by the Evangelist solely because of their bearing on the discourse, for both conjointly give rise to it: for the immediate occasion for the first words (verses 26, 27) is the multitude finding Jesus on the other side of the sea, and wondering how He came there, He having preceded them by the miracle of the "walking on the water," and they followed Him, as He said to them, because "they did eat of the loaves," which He had miraculously multiplied.

The more general teaching of these miracles I have deduced elsewhere. I shall now only notice their special bearing on what follows.

5. "When Jesus then lifted up his eyes, and saw a great com-

6 And this he said to prove him: for he himself knew what he would do.

7 Philip answered him, [d] Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient for them, that every one of them may take a little.

[d] See Numb. xi. 21, 22.

8 One of his disciples, Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, saith unto him,

9 There is a lad here, which hath five barley loaves, and two small fishes: [e] but what are they among so many?

[e] 2 Kings iv. 43.

---

6. "To prove him"—"to try him" *tentans* (Vulg.).

pany," &c. Here is the mark of an eye-witness. None would have thought of mentioning the Lord as doing this except one who had noticed it. It is not in the Synoptics. There is an apparent discrepancy between St. John's account and that of the Synoptics, which can easily be explained. According to the Synoptics, the disciples first mention the coming need: according to St. John, the Lord takes the initiative. Very probably he addressed the words "Whence shall we buy bread?" &c., to Philip privately, at the outset, when He saw the multitudes trooping to Him, and received Philip's answer; and then, later on in the day, after He had taught them for some time, the Apostles began to be anxious as to how the multitudes were to be fed, and they came to Him that He should dismiss them. Then, in their perplexity, one mentions the lad with the five barley loaves, but, as it were in despair, "What are they among so many?"

The speciality of St. John's account is the notice of the Lord putting this trial question to Philip, though the Evangelist, who knew, even then, the intention of the Lord, said, "He Himself knew what He would do." A similar trial underlies the whole of this discourse. The Lord, in what follows, sets forth Himself as the Bread of Life, as the Living Bread, as feeding men with Himself, the Bread of Life, through His Flesh, He and He only knowing all the time how all this would be brought about; and all this time saying things to "prove," not the multitude, not the Jews only, but His very disciples; applying, at last, the touchstone

10 And Jesus said, Make the men sit down. Now there was much grass in the place. So the men sat down, in number about five thousand.

11 And Jesus took the loaves; and when he had given thanks, he distributed to the disciples, and the disciples to them that were set down; and likewise of the fishes as much as they would.

12 When they were filled, he said unto his disciples, Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost.

10. "Make the men . . . . So the men sat down" *Facite homines discumbere . . . . discubuerunt ergo viri.* The first should be translated "people"—the second, "men" or "males."

11. "To the disciples, and the disciples" omitted by ℵ., A., B., L., Cursives (1, 33, 118, 254), many old Latin (a, c, f, ff², l, q_{ue}, Vulg., Syriac (Curetonian and Peshito), and some versions; but D., T., Δ, Λ, later Uncials, almost all Cursives, some old Latin (b, e), retain the words.

which separated those who half believed from those who believed implicitly.

I have noticed elsewhere (on Matth. xiv. 19) the significance of the Lord's feeding the multitudes through the hands of the Apostles.

It will be necessary to mention here that the consensus of MSS., versions and editors, is against retaining the words, "to the disciples, and the disciples," in verse 11. So that that verse should read, "when He had given thanks, He distributed to them that were set down." It is doubtful whether they were originally in St. John's account. The fact, however, remains untouched, that the Lord distributed through means of the Apostles, inasmuch as each Synoptic mentions it. Supposing that the words in question ought to be omitted, we learn that what the Lord did through the Apostles, He did Himself. The Lord Himself gives men His Flesh as the Bread, but being not present Himself in visible personality, He does it through the instrumentality of others, and yet each man who receives, receives it as from Himself.

12. "Gather up the fragments." From St. John alone we learn that the direction to allow no waste came from the Lord. The food which had been produced supernaturally, and with such apparent ease, was not to be held cheap on that account. Every fragment was to be esteemed precious.

13 Therefore they gathered *them* together, and filled twelve baskets with the fragments of the five barley loaves, which remained over and above unto them that had eaten.

14 Then those men, when they had seen the miracle that Jesus did, said, This is of a [f] truth that prophet that should come into the world.

[f] Gen. xlix. 10. Deut. xviii. 15, 18. Matt. xi. 3. ch. i. 21. & iv. 19, 25. & vii. 40.

15 ¶ When Jesus therefore perceived that they would come and take him by force, to make him a king, he departed again into a mountain himself alone.

---

14. "Then those men;" rather, "then the people."

14. "Then those men, when they had seen . . . that prophet that should come," &c. This was only natural. They had some of them seen, and all had heard of the miracles done in Jerusalem. They had been witnesses of His works of healing, for which they had followed Him in such numbers; and now this miracle of the loaves crowned their carnal hopes. They exclaimed, "This is of a truth that prophet," but "*that* prophet" was, according to all their sacred books, to be more than a prophet—He was to be a leader like Moses, and a king like David—and now they thought the time was come when He must put Himself at their head and deliver them. And so,

15. "When Jesus therefore perceived that they would take him . . . he departed again into a mountain," &c. "He departed alone," because, as we read in St. Matthew and St. Mark, he had constrained His disciples to get into a ship, and to go before Him to the other side. "The task of Jesus at this juncture was by no means an easy one. If He were immediately to depart with His disciples, the commotion, instead of being appeased, was in danger of spreading in Galilee. If He remained together with His disciples, they might be infected by the contagion of that carnal enthusiasm which would only find too many points of contact in their hearts. . . . It was therefore needful to be on the alert. And, first of all, He was anxious to send away His disciples to the other side of the lake, for the purpose of cutting off all solidarity between them and the multitude. This is the explanation of the singular expression of Matth. xiv. 22, and Mark vi. 45, 'He immediately *constrained*

16 [g] And when even was *now* come, his disciples went down unto the sea,

17 And entered into a ship, and went over the sea toward Capernaum. And it was now dark, and Jesus was not come to them.

18 And the sea arose by reason of a great wind that blew.

19 So when they had rowed about five and twenty or thirty furlongs, they see Jesus walking on the sea, and drawing nigh unto the ship: and they were afraid.

20 But he saith unto them, It is I; be not afraid.

21 Then they willingly received him into the ship: and immediately the ship was at the land whither they went.

[g] Matt. xiv. 23. Mark vi. 47.

---

17. "Not." ℵ, B., D., L., and many Old Latin, read, "not yet." A., most later Uncials, most Cursives, Vulg., Cureton and Peshito Syriac, read as in Rec. Text.

21. "They willingly received Him." "They willed to receive him;" *voluerunt* (Vulg.)

His disciples to embark and to go before Him to the other side, while He sent away the people.' No motive for such *constraint* is furnished by the Synoptic narrative, and perhaps the disciples were themselves ignorant of the true reason for so sudden a step on the part of their Master. When this was done, Jesus calmed and dismissed the multitude." (Godet.)

17. "And entered into a ship . . . Jesus was not come to them." Their intention was, most probably, to skirt along the northern coast, and to take up the Lord at some point between Bethsaida Julias and Capernaum. Something of this sort is implied in the words, "Jesus was not come to them," and still more distinctly if we read, "was not *yet* come to them."

18. "And the sea arose by reason of a great wind that blew." Their intentions, however, seemed to be frustrated by the sudden storm, which seems to have driven them into the middle of the lake, for rowing twenty-five or thirty furlongs with a violent north wind would drive them into the middle of the sea, where St. Matthew tells us they were.

21. "Then they willingly received him into the ship," &c. "They willingly received Him," *i.e.*, they willed to receive Him, because their fear of the supposed supernatural appearance was turned into

22 ¶ The day following, when the people which stood on the other side of the sea saw that there was none other boat there, save that one whereinto his disciples were entered, and that Jesus went not with his disciples into the boat, but *that* his disciples were gone away alone;

23 (Howbeit there came other boats from Tiberias nigh unto the place where they did eat bread, after that the Lord had given thanks:)

---

22. A., B., L., some Cursives and Old Latin, Vulgate, and some versions, read, "save one," omitting "that whereinto His disciples were entered."

joy, when they found it was no other than their Master, Who was walking on the water. The fear which made them cry out was turned into readiness to receive Him.

"And immediately the ship was at the land whither they went." A question has been raised whether this was by miracle. If there be something so rootedly objectionable in a miracle that, if possible, we must avoid supposing one, even in the Life of the Incarnate Son, born by one miracle, raised again by another, then we must suppose that they rowed very rapidly, so as to traverse a considerable distance in a shorter time than usual; but the rejoinder is, why should such a thing be mentioned at all? The fact is noted as if it were something out of the natural order of things. It was surely within the sphere of our Lord's benevolence, after they had toiled all night, and were drenched and weary, to save them the additional labour. If the boat progressed naturally, it could not be said to arrive *immediately* at its destination. If it is a miracle, it has a true Evangelical significance. If a soul spiritually receives Christ, He may see fit, in some cases, to shorten its labour, or otherwise alleviate the severity of its discipline, and bring it at once to some further point in its heavenward journey.

Such are the two miracles which jointly occasion the following discourse. The both bear upon its central Mystery; for in the one the Lord feeds His followers by superhuman means, and in the other He shows that He can raise His Body far above the conditions of this lower nature.

22. "The day following, when the people which stood on the other side," &c. This, of course, does not mean all the multitude,

24 When the people therefore saw that Jesus was not there, neither his disciples, they also took shipping, and came to Capernaum, seeking for Jesus.

25 And when they found him on the other side of the sea, they said unto him, Rabbi, when camest thou hither?

---

but only the more eager ones, who desired to force the Lord, at once, to declare Himself King. These, no doubt, considering how they might find Jesus, saw that there was only one boat, and this not the one by which the disciples had left [the words "save that whereinto His disciples were entered" have little authority, and disturb the sense, for they seem to suggest that the disciples were only just then embarking, whereas they were now on the other side]. These, then, seeing that Jesus could not have passed over in this boat, as it had not left the shore, took shipping, and were able to accomplish this because, owing to the storm, other boats, not belonging to that part of the coast, had come from Tiberias, and taken refuge near where they were: pressing these into their service, they crossed over to Capernaum.

In reading over these three verses [22, 23, 24] it seems at first sight difficult to understand why the Evangelist should labour, as he does, to describe this scene; the people waiting on the shore expecting Jesus to appear, perplexed at not seeing Him, and discovering that the disciples had gone away alone, pressing into the service the strange boats which, by accident, were there, taking shipping in them, and crossing the sea to Capernaum, seeking for the Lord. The solution is not far to seek. St. John describes these men taking all this labour to find Jesus, in order to account for the words which the Lord utters when they accosted Him with, "Rabbi, when camest thou hither?" He retorted upon them with, "Ye seek me, not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled. Labour not for the meat which perisheth," &c. "Ye have worked hard to find Me, because I satisfied your natural hunger. Work not for the meat which perisheth," &c.

It is saying very little to assert that the discourse which springs from these words, and to its very end, keeps, as it were, on these lines, is the most astonishing in all Scripture. There is nothing to be compared to it for the great things which it holds out as within the reach of men, and for the mystery in which it envelops them.

26 Jesus answered them and said, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Ye seek me, not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves, and were filled.

‖ Or, *Work not.*
[h] ver. 54. ch. iv. 14.

27 ‖ Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but [h] for that meat which endureth unto everlast-

---

26. "Miracles." "Signs;" *signa* (Vulg.)
27. "Labour." Same word as in next verse is rendered "work."

26. "Jesus answered them . . . . ye seek me, not because ye saw the signs, but because," &c. In a sense they had sought Jesus because of the sign, for when they had seen the miracle of the loaves, they exclaimed, "This is of a truth that prophet," but Jesus read their hearts. They desired to make Him a king, because they thought that One Who could thus produce food without labour was the very king they wanted. They regarded the sign, not so much as shewing that He was the Messiah, but that He was a Messiah Who would exert supernatural power to save them from labour, and enable them to live in ease and indulgence. The miracle was to them a pledge of nothing but the carnal satisfaction of their lowest desires. It is well to take notice that the men whom He thus reproved must have been, virtually, the same as the "Jews" of verse 41. The "Jews" in this Gospel are always that part of the nation who looked for a carnal Messiah, and abhorred the claims of Jesus because He set Himself forth as a Spiritual One. It is important to notice this, as it is a proof of the unity of the discourse.

27. "Labour [work] not for the meat which perisheth." These words, of course, refer to the labour, or work, which they had given themselves to find Jesus, because He had miraculously increased the bread: "Ye seek Me because of the bread I created for you: Trouble not yourselves about Me, seek not laboriously for Me, on account of this perishable food, because I have better food to give you. Labour for—give yourselves trouble about—food which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of Man gives."

"Labour [work] for that meat which the Son of Man shall give." Is it needful to *labour*, if the Son of Man *gives?* Yes, assuredly, for only by labour and trouble can earnestness and true desire for the gift be shown. The "gift" is not wages, but it would be thrown away upon those who take no pains about it, and so exhibit no real desire for it.

ing life, which the Son of man shall give unto you: [i] for him hath God the Father sealed.

28 Then said they unto him, What shall we do, that we might work the works of God?

29 Jesus answered and said unto them, [k] This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.

[i] Matt. iii. 17. & xvii. 5. Mark i. 11. & ix. 7. Luke iii. 22. & ix. 35. ch. i. 33. & v. 37. & viii. 18. Acts ii. 22. 2 Pet. i. 17.

[k] 1 John iii. 23.

27. "Him hath God the Father sealed." "Him the Father, even God, hath sealed" (Revisers).

"Him hath God the Father sealed." This "sealing" means "especially fitting Him," and "appointing Him to give" the Bread of Life. It is probably that to which our Lord alludes when He speaks of Himself as "sanctified and sent into the world" by the Father. (John x. 36.)

28. "Then said they unto him, What shall we do, that we might work the works of God?" The works of God here must mean the works well pleasing to God: such works as may move God to give to those who do them the Bread which endureth unto everlasting life.

29. "Jesus answered . . . . on him whom he hath sent." As at the outset of this discourse the Lord here mentions "believing" as the one work of God by which we are to obtain the Bread of Life, it will be necessary clearly to understand what this "believing" is.

Our Lord, in demanding men's belief in Himself, always demands that they believe something special and definite respecting Himself. He asks of the Apostles, "Whom say ye that I am?" On another occasion He asks, "Believe ye that I am able to do this?" Again, He says, "If ye believe not that I am He," *i.e.*, the Messiah (or it may be something infinitely greater than any human Messiah) "ye shall die in your sins." Again, to Martha, "I am the Resurrection and the Life. . . . . Whosoever believeth in Me shall never die." "Believest thou THIS?" Again, "Reach hither thy hand and thrust it into My side, and be not faithless, but believing," believing, that is, that I am risen indeed.

Believing in Christ, according to all His teaching respecting belief or faith, is believing that He is all that He says that He is, and, consequently, can do all that He has undertaken to do. Seeing, then, that this discourse is entirely upon Christ as the Bread of Life, the

30 They said therefore unto him, [l] What sign shewest thou then, that we may see, and believe thee? what dost thou work?

31 [m] Our fathers did eat manna in the desert; as it is written, [n] He gave them bread from heaven to eat.

[l] Matt. xii. 38. & xvi. 1. Mark viii. 11. 1 Cor. i. 22.
[m] Ex. xvi. 15. Num. xi. 7. Neh. ix 15. 1 Cor. x. 3.
[n] Ps. lxxviii. 24, 25.

---

belief throughout it proclaimed as necessary, is a particular and realizing belief in Him as the Giver of the Bread which endures to Everlasting Life. It is, *at this first stage of the discourse*, belief in Him as the Dispenser of the Enduring Bread, for as the Lord goes on He increases His demands on their faith, and according as He rises in His demands so must their belief in Him increase, if their belief be worthy of Him as "the Word made Flesh."

The faith here, then, is not faith in His Godhead, or in His atoning Sacrifice, or in His infinite Merits—faith in all these will come in due time; but at this stage it must be a faith which would procure for them the ever-enduring Bread. For they had asked, What shall we do that we may work the works of God? They asked this because He had said, "Work . . . . for the meat which endureth to Eternal Life, which the Son of Man shall give you," and His answer corresponds to their question. It is: "Your work of God to procure for yourselves the ever-enduring Bread is to believe in Him Whom God hath consecrated and then hath sent to dispense it. If you really believe on Him as being the Giver of such Food, you will naturally come to Him for the Food He has to give, just as, because you believed Him able to give an abundance of earthly food you have pursued Him very earnestly and laboriously from Bethsaida to Capernaum."

30. "They said therefore unto him, What sign shewest thou then . . . . ? what dost thou work?" This is not the question of sheer stolid unbelief. Christ by no means treats it as such. He had miraculously fed five thousand men with perishable bread; but was this sufficient to prove that He could give them the Bread of Life? By asking them to believe on Him as the Giver of such Bread, He had claimed a faith in Himself that He could give what neither Moses nor any other servant of God had ever given. What work did He do corresponding to such a claim? They reminded Him of the way

32 Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven.

33 For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world.

34 °Then said they unto him, Lord, evermore give us this bread. ° See ch. iv. 15.

35 And Jesus said unto them, PI am the bread P ver. 48, 58.

---

33. "The bread of God is *He*;" rather, "that."

in which God, by the hand of Moses, fed their fathers, a far greater multitude, for forty years. What did He do greater than this to substantiate His claim to their belief that He could give them the Bread of Eternal Life?

Jesus promises no greater sign, but makes a far greater demand on their faith. He at once sets Himself far above Moses.

32. "Moses gave you not," &c. "Moses gave you no enduring bread. His bread could not be kept for two days without corrupting, but "My Father giveth you," through My hand (verse 32) "the true bread from heaven." The true Bread, that which gives the highest conceivable nourishment, the nourishment of eternal existence.

33. "For the bread of God is that [not He] which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world." The "Bread of God" in this verse is not yet fully set forth as Christ; for the true rendering is "it," not "He:" and the Jews would not have asked Him, if they understood that He Himself was the Bread, "to evermore give them that bread." They had by no means sufficient belief for *that*. They no doubt inferred from the miracle of the loaves, and His other miracles, that He could give them some sort of heavenly food which might indefinitely prolong their lives: but they could never, in their then state, have believed Himself to be this bread. "Lord, evermore give us this bread," must on their lips have meant, "Lord, evermore give us such bread as will prolong our lives here for a few years."

35. "And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that cometh," &c. This is the beginning of the second great stage in the

of life: [q] he that cometh to me shall never hunger: and he
q ch. iv. 14. & vii. 37. that believeth on me shall never thirst.
r ver. 26, 64. 36 [r] But I said unto you, That ye also have seen me, and believe not.
s ver. 45. 37 [s] All that the Father giveth me shall come

37. "All that." In the neuter, "the whole that;" "all that which" (Revisers).

discourse. The first is that He gives them the Bread of life. The second is that He Himself is the Bread of life.

"He that cometh . . . never hunger: he that believeth . . . never thirst." What is the significance of this "coming" and "believing?" Evidently this: he that cometh to Christ for the Bread which the Father hath "sealed" Him to give shall never hunger, *i.e.*, shall never desire spiritual grace and sustenance, and not have it given to him, because Christ will give to that man the Life-giving Bread which He has to give: and He that believeth in Christ as being the Wine of Eternal Life, without which his soul must faint and die, will, under the influence of this belief, come to Christ for the Wine of Eternal Life, and will not be refused by Him; but Christ will give Himself to be partaken of by that man, as a thirsty man partakes of drink, and is refreshed. The ideas of "coming" and "believing" must be united together as supplementing one another; he that cometh must *come*, not as these Jews pursued our Lord, but come *believing* in Him as the Giver of the true Bread; and he that *believeth* must believe with a belief which makes him "*come*" to Christ in prayer, and in the means of grace. Here, then, is a very great advance. The whole matter of the Food of Life is raised into a spiritual sphere. It was now impossible for the multitude to ask, "Lord, evermore give us this bread." And at once the Lord, the Searcher of hearts, saw that the ignorant belief which they had had in Him as the Giver of (in some sort) enduring bread, was arrested and dissipated.

36. "But I said unto you [perhaps in some words not recorded], ye have seen me, and believe not." Here He alludes to their words, "What sign shewest thou that we may *see* and *believe* thee?"

To see Christ here is, of course, not merely to look at Him, but to see Him as the Son of God. Further on we shall find a verb used which has a much deeper meaning.

37. "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me," &c. Our

to me; and [1] him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out.

[1] Matt. xxiv. 24. ch. x. 28. 29. 2 Tim. ii. 19. 1 John ii. 19.

Lord here seems to break the thread of His discourse, and to set forth another very deep mystery, the secret choice or election of God, of some persons to be taught of the Father, and so to come to Christ, and of others not. Thus, verse 39, "This is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing," &c. Again, after their murmuring (44), "No man can come unto me, except the Father . . . draw him." Again (45), "Every one that hath . . . learned of the Father cometh unto me." Now are these words said in judgment or in mercy, in condemnation or in mitigation? They seem to be said in mitigation, to show that these Jews did not believe the very high things which Christ was now saying, because they were not "drawn to Him"—because they were not "taught of God."

I think this will be plain from the following considerations. There were then gathered round our Lord, and probably in the synagogue, three classes of persons. There were the Jews, or multitude, who either now rejected His claims or were indifferent. These, having seen His miracles, for a moment believed in Him as a Messiah of a low carnal type. Among these, of course, there would be various shades of opinion respecting Him. Then, secondly, there were disciples, who believed, but not implicitly. They had accepted Him as the Christ, but could not stand the test of the "hard saying" (ver. 60), and so fell away. But, thirdly, there were those, a very small number, who believed in Him implicitly; who, having accepted Him as the Christ, the Son of God, felt that if they had accepted Him for this, they must accept Him for everything. God, they were sure, could not have sent into the world One Who would exaggerate His own claims on men's faith. The simplicity of this their faith is seen in their first "coming." They were originally humble, simple-minded, and religious men, who had heard the Voice of God in the message of the Baptist, and attached themselves to him, and therefore accepted him as sent to prepare the way for the Christ, and to point Him out. This John did when he said, "Behold the Lamb of God," and at once they took him at his word, left the servant, and joined themselves to the Master. Then His miracles, and the wisdom of His discourses, and the surpassing holiness of His life, which they and they only, had opportunities of

[u] Matt. xxvi. 39. ch. v. 30.

38 For I came down from heaven, [u] not to do

narrowly watching, kept them firm: but, of course, because He specially watched over and kept *them* (ch. xvii. 12). Even their faith was weak: it often wavered, but never with respect to His claims as "having come forth from God."

It was the design of God that these men should be the origin and foundation of the Church. It was the will of God that His Son's Church should be built upon a very small number of men, a mere handful, just eleven in number, who were not remarkable for intellect, for learning, for eloquence, only for the simplicity of their faith. It was not the design of God that His Church should be built upon the many.

Now our Lord has respect to the simple implicit faith which He discerned in these men, and which, because He knew that it was the sign of His Father's Election, far more than made up to Him for the unbelief of the multitude. In the great Intercession of chap. xvii., He thanks God that He has kept *them*, "those that thou gavest Me, I have kept." This cannot but refer to the same counsel of God, set forth in these verses, that there were an elect few which were given to Christ, and the rest could not believe and come as yet.

"As yet," for we cannot suppose that those who had not as yet come were all finally lost: the Kingdom of God did not come in power till the Day of Pentecost, after the Son of Man had been lifted up; then a multitude who had rejected and opposed Him before, "knew that it was He." Then the Lord "sent the rod of His power out of Zion, and He ruled even in the midst among his enemies."

We now return to verse 37, "All that the Father giveth me, shall come to me." Shall actually come to me, and stop not short—shall not only be drawn, but drawn effectually.

"Him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out." The Lord's meaning here exhibits simply the assurance that, if in the midst of so much unbelief, there comes here and there one—the right one, given to Him of the Father,—He will assuredly not reject or cast him away, "even if he come ever so creepingly" (as the Berlenb-Bibel says). "Thus do we rightly hold fast that meaning of the word which the Holy Spirit has impressed upon the souls of so many, from age to age, for their full assurance in coming to

mine own will, [x] but the will of him that sent me.

[x] ch. iv. 34.

39 And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, [y] that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day.

[y] ch. x. 28. & xvii. 12. & xviii. 9.

---

39. "The Father's will which hath sent me;" perhaps, "the will of Him that," &c. So ℵ, A., B., C., D., L., ten Cursives, some Old Latin (b, e, f, q), Sah., Copt., Syriac; but later Uncials, almost all Cursives, Vulg., &c., read "The Fathers."

Christ." (Stier, who also quotes Schleiermacher.) "He utters this word Himself, that however long men may neglect it, however long it may be that they see and hear, and yet believe Him not, when they *do* finally come, He cannot and will not and must not cast them away."

38. "I came down from heaven." By His Holy Incarnation. This is a further advance in mystery, and one which the Jews met with murmuring. "Not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." This "will of him that sent me" must in this place be taken, not generally, but with particular reference to that will of God set forth in the two next verses. With respect to this, Godet remarks: "If Jesus, when He came into the world, had in ever so slight a degree done a work of His own, distinct from that of God, His receptions or His refusals might have been determined, at least in part, by personal sympathies or repugnances, which would not have entirely coincided with the work of God in the hearts of men. We here again meet with that idea of perfect docility with respect to the Divine work which formed the basis of the address in chap. v.

39, 40: "This is the will of him that sent me, that of all which he hath given me," &c.; "This is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son." Do these verses refer to the same persons? If we take as our guide the express reference to the twelve in chap. xvii. 12, as those whom God has given to His Son, then the reference in verse 39 is to the apostolic company, and that in verse 40 to a wider election, either at present external to the twelve, and yet following Jesus, as Joseph and Matthias and probably many others (Acts i. 21-23); or to all that would "believe on Him through their word."

39. "But should raise it up again at the last day." 40. "I will

40 And this is the will of him that sent me, [z] that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day.

[z] ver. 27, 47, 54. ch. iii. 15, 16, & iv. 14.

40. "Him that sent me." ℵ, B., C., D., L., read "My Father;" Vulg., "My Father who sent me;" but A., E., G., H., K., S., other later Uncials, almost all Cursives, read "of him that sent me."

raise him up at the last day." It is to be remarked that the result of the Father's "giving of men to Christ" of verse 39, and of "seeing the Son, and believing on him" of verse 40, is the Resurrection to Eternal Life, not of the Soul—that has already been resuscitated by having seen and believed on Christ,—but of the Body. From this point, at least, if not before, the idea of the bodily Resurrection dominates to the end of the discourse. I will not say that the Life of the Soul is precluded, but it is presupposed; and when the Life of the Soul exists by continued union with the Source of all Spiritual Life, then the life of the Glorified Body, as derived from the same source of life, comes by an act of Christ at the last day. The latter seems henceforth to be in the mind of the Lord. "In the interview with the woman of Samaria, Jesus did not proceed beyond the representation of Himself as spiritual, living water, which refreshes and sustains the soul; here He already intimates that He is about to go further, and to describe Himself as the Restorer and Transformer of the *entire man*, even of the Body." (Olshausen.) Again, "We would entreat every intelligent reader to take this as the first key to the understanding of the whole of the subsequent discourse concerning the Lord's Flesh and Blood. He who does not recognize the glorified corporeity of the Resurrection as the goal of all God's dealings with the children of men delivered from the bondage of death; he who does not see that in order to the victory of grace over sin, the restitution *in integrum* of fallen man, something would be eternally wanting, if bodily death was not also vanquished, so that the Resurrection alone consummates the Life; and, further, that this restoration can only come to us through the *body* of the Second Adam, the Man from heaven, first glorified: he who does not apprehend all this, will never understand either the Lord's Supper itself, or the testimony which the Lord here gives of its deep foundation and principle." (Stier.)

The reader will notice that the neuter gender is used in verse 39:

41 The Jews then murmured at him, because he said, I am the bread which came down from heaven.

41. "At Him." "Concerning Him" (Revisers).

"all which he hath given me," and the masculine in verse 40: "Every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, I will raise him up." This is generally interpreted as if the first, "all which," was considered as the whole, and no part of it lost; and the second, as if each part of this whole will in due time exercise the personal conscious acts of seeing and believing. Cyril interprets it as if the Father gives to the Son a whole which is without life, but no part of which must be lost; and the Son quickens and continues in life each part. But may not the first refer to an election on the part of God, which insures that all included in it come to Christ; and the second, to a more general promise (considered as independent of any secret election), which promise insures that *every one* "seeing the Son, and believing on him," shall have everlasting life?

"Seeth the Son." This word "seeing" is not the same as that in verse 36, and has a much deeper meaning—signifying "earnestly contemplating"—looking to Him as one capable of giving all life of body and soul.

41. "The Jews then murmured at him, because he said, I am the bread," &c. Let us notice the saying at which they murmured. It was because He set forth that which pre-supposed and necessitated His Incarnation. They thought that they knew how He came into the world. "Is not this Jesus, whose father and mother we know?" This truth of the Incarnation of the Son of God is the root-mystery of this chapter. They who set before themselves this great thing, that the "Word was made flesh," and adoringly contemplate it, so far as God has revealed it, are in the way of realizing all that is in this discourse. For the Incarnation is that Christ came amongst us not spiritually, but "in the Flesh." He was amongst us, not as an angel or disembodied spirit, but in the Flesh. He came thus in the Flesh as the Second Adam to redeem those who had contracted sin, not through consciously following an evil example, but through unconsciously receiving the flesh and blood of their first father. He came to redeem, not their souls and spirits only, but their bodies, so that they should be raised again in their bodies. He was able to redeem the bodies of all men, because His Godhead dwelt

42 And they said, [a] Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? how is it then that he saith, I came down from heaven?

[a] Matt. xiii. 55. Mark vi. 3. Luke iv. 22.

43 Jesus therefore answered and said unto them, Murmur not among yourselves.

[b] Cant. i. 4. ver. 65.

44 [b] No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day.

---

42. Some few MSS. (B., C., Copt.), read "now" instead of "then"—"how doth He now say." Preponderance of authorities (א, A., D., L., later Uncials, almost all Cursives, Old Latin, Vulg.), much in favour of "then."

in His very Body. (Coloss. ii. 9.) So that the fact that the Jews murmured because He set forth that which implied His Incarnation, is very instructive, and very full of warning.

43. "Jesus [therefore] answered and said unto them, Murmur not . . . . draw him," &c. How is it that He entered into no explanations in order to quiet their murmurs? Simply because He could not. How could He say to them, "I have no human father. I was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of my Mother whilst a Virgin; but in my former state, I was in the beginning with God, and was God"? He could give no explanation which at that time would not increase their difficulty.

But He proceeded to account (I believe in the way of palliation) for their unbelief, in not receiving His every word with implicit faith, on the ground that they were not drawn of God to Him. Those who "had heard and learned of the Father" accepted Him as the very Christ, and so received all His words, no matter how deep and startling, and so stumbled not at such words as "I came down from heaven."

44. "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day." These words are clearly a continuation of the thread of the discourse which had been interrupted. They follow on verse 39: "All which the Father giveth . . . . I will raise it up at the last day," and verse 40: "Every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, I will raise him up at the last day."

Mark the emphasis laid on the bodily resurrection by these three repetitions. It shows that throughout this discourse the Lord has

45 [c] It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. [d] Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me.

46 [e] Not that any man hath seen the Father, [f] save he which is of God, he hath seen the Father.

[c] Is. liv. 13. Jer. xxxi. 34. Mic. iv. 2. Heb. viii. 10. & x. 16.
[d] ver. 37.
[e] ch. i. 18. & v. 37.
[f] Matt. xi. 27. Luke x. 22. ch. i. 18. & vii. 29. & viii. 19.

45. "Therefore" omitted in ℵ, B., C., D., L., S., 69, 124, most Old Latin, Vulg.; but retained in A., later Uncials, almost all Cursives, &c.

in His Mind chiefly, though not wholly, the Redemption of the Body.

There is a lesson full of comfort to be got from this verse—that if anyone feels his soul drawn to God in prayer, it is because God desires the salvation of such a one, and what he has to do is to follow the drawing of the Lord, and surrender himself to it, being assured that God Himself is drawing him to Christ as the Bestower of all true life.

45. "It is written in the prophets . . . . learned of the Father, cometh unto me." Our Lord gives the sense of Isaiah liv. as teaching a general truth, that all the true children of the Church are taught of God. And He infers that, "Every one that hath heard and hath learned of the Father," cometh to Him. And it must be so. If the Father has sent His own Son into the world to be its Redeemer and Judge, then all God's teaching must ultimately lead to such a Saviour and Judge.

46. "Not that any man hath seen the Father, save, &c. . . . . he hath seen the Father." These words obviate any misconception as to the mode of teaching. It must be secret, by the invisible operation of God, and cannot be direct, as when a child sits at the foot of his teacher and sees him.

No man can speak of the things of God as having "seen" them save One. "No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." Notice that here there is a further advance in mystery, and consequent difficulty to those listening to Him in receiving His words implicitly. Here the Lord puts himself far above even Moses, who saw God face to face [Deut. xxxiv. 10], and to whom God spake as to a friend; even he saw not God as the Son hath seen Him.

47 Verily, verily, I say unto you, [g] He that believeth on me hath everlasting life.

48 [h] I am that bread of life.

49 [i] Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead.

[g] ch. iii. 16, 18, 36. ver. 40.
[h] ver. 33, 35.
[i] ver. 31.

47. "On me" omitted by ℵ, B., L.; but A., C., D., later Uncials, all Cursives, Old Latin, Vulg., and Peshito retain it. Cureton Syriac adds, "*in Deum*." The words can only be omitted by making all other authorities (*i. e.* the testimony of all Christendom) yield to three MSS.

49. "And are dead." "And died" (Alford and Revisers).

Verses 47-51. We now come to that part of the discourse to which all the rest leads. The Lord here, before enunciating the mystery of mysteries, sums up, as it were, the leading ideas which have gone before and reasserts them.

47, 48. "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." "I am that bread of life." What is the connection between these two verses? for they seem to be two independent assertions—one assuring everlasting life to a certain act of the mind or spirit, the other asserting that He Who speaks is the bread of life. The connection is evidently that which I noticed between the first and second clauses in verse 35, that the "believing" recognized throughout this discourse is the believing in Jesus as *being* that, and *doing* that which in this discourse He sets Himself forth as being and doing. It is the believing in Him as being Himself the Bread which came down from heaven, and as giving Himself as the Bread which came down from heaven.

Life requires bread to support it. Each of the two lives, the temporal and the eternal, requires its respective bread; and "he that believeth on me hath everlasting life," because such as are really and heartily believing this, will come to Me for the Bread of life and feed on Me as the Bread of life, and discern Me under any form under which I may proffer them the Bread of life. The Lord now proceeds with a second reference to the Manna.

49, 50. "Your fathers did eat manna . . . . This is the bread which cometh down from heaven . . . . not die." This is the repetition of what is in verses 31 and 32, except that the Lord here brings out far more emphatically the real deadness and unprofitableness of the Manna. "Your fathers did eat it, and are dead." This is in contrast with, "I am the bread . . . . that a man may eat thereof and not die."

50 [k] This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die. [k] ver. 51, 58.

51 I am the living bread[1] which came down [1] ch. iii. 13.

What are the respective deaths in these two sentences? They are in each case the death of the body, following upon, and as a punishment for, a previous death of the soul.

Here let us, for a moment, consider the astonishing fact that the daily miracle of the Manna produced no spiritual life in those who saw the miracle, and ate the bread. If anything, in the way of teaching, was calculated to produce spiritual life, it was this Manna. St. Paul calls it "spiritual meat." It was a sermon preached to them every day of their lives, that the God of Abraham sustained them by a special daily exertion of Almighty power and goodness; and yet it was totally without grace—that is without power. "Their carcases fell in the wilderness because of unbelief." No mere outward sign addressed to the outward ear, no mere outward rite addressed to the senses could be more impressive. The Bread, then, opposite to this, which is to sustain spiritual and eternal life, must be more than teaching, more than emblem or figure suggestive only of good things from God. It must be something which gives grace and power to the whole man: it cannot be mere instruction, but it must be power to obey that instruction; it cannot be a mere remembrance to call to mind, but it must be grace and internal power to act upon the remembrance, which grace and power does not expire with the sleep of the body in the grave, but remains (where and how, God knows); so that the man who has, and retains this grace of life, cannot properly be said to die, for because of the Resurrection his sleep in the tomb is but the image of death, not its reality.

And now the Lord proceeds to set forth the mystery.

51. "I am the living bread which came down from heaven." Before He had only said, "I am the Bread of Life," now he says, "I am the Living Bread." This is in contrast with the Manna. Of all the forms of human food which God had vouchsafed to man, the Manna was that which seemed to come most directly from Himself. It was the most heavenly form of food ever given to sustain human life. It was even called "angels' food." (Ps. lxxviii. 25.) And yet, though coming direct from the hand of the living God, it was dead. Whereas the Lord says, "I am the Living Bread which came down

from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for

---

from heaven," not from some atmosphere a little above this world, but from the heaven of heavens, from the bosom of the Father.

But if the Lord calls Himself bread, as bread He must be eaten, or He would not have called Himself "bread;" for the end or purpose of bread is to be eaten, and so He proceeds,

"If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever." This must look to the eternal life of the body as following on the spiritual life of the soul, or it would not be in contrast with what precedes. In the two previous verses He had been speaking of the Manna, and of Himself as the Living Bread as contrasted with it. They who eat of the Manna died, and if their bodies are raised again, it will not be because they eat the Manna; but he who eats Christ as the Living Bread shall live for ever, because of the life-imparting nature of that which He eats.

Hitherto, all has led to the question, "how is Christ as the Bread of Life to be eaten?" At the beginning of this verse He makes the bread to be His whole Person, "I am the Living Bread." The bread here is that which is signified by the "I am." But the Lord Jesus has two whole and perfect natures in His One Person, and He sometimes speaks as if His Personality resided in one of those natures, and sometimes in the other. When He says, "Before Abraham was, I am," He speaks as God only, and when He speaks of Himself as about to be crucified and to die, He speaks as if He were man only. Again, His manhood is like ours, "of a reasonable soul and human flesh." Now seeing that He has these two natures, which of them does He use as His instrument by which to feed us, and, in feeding, to impart life to us? If we had not known this chapter, I think we should have, without doubt, said, that it is His Godhead through which He gives us His life, for His Godhead is that One of His two natures which has Life in itself; and inasmuch as it permeates all existences, He could communicate Life to us from His Godhead directly, without the use of any means whatsoever, merely by a direct act of His Divine omnipotence. Or, if not His Godhead, we should have said that He would make His Human Soul or Spirit the means by which to make us partakers of His Life, in which case it would have been by those means of communication by which one soul acts upon another, as by instruction, by communication of ideas and thoughts, by

ever: and [m] the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.

[m] Heb, x. 5, 10.

---

51. "The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world;" rather, "The bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world." The second "I will give" is very doubtful indeed. It is not in B., C., D., L., Old Latin, Vulg., Cureton Syriac, and some versions. A. (Codex Alexandrius) is, unfortunately, wanting from vi. 50 to viii. 52. The Peshito Syriac has, "I give."

rational intercourse, and such things. But here He passes by His Godhead, and the higher part of His Manhood, and fixes our faith on the lower part of His human nature, that is, on His Flesh. "I am the Living Bread." "The Bread that I will give is My Flesh, which is for the Life of the world." On this word of Christ's belief rests, and, if it is true belief, cannot stop short, and can go no further.

Now if we consider our nature of flesh in which sin is inherent, there seems to be a certain deep necessity why the Lord should make His Flesh the means for the communication of His Life, for the Lord Who spake these words is the Second Man, the Lord from heaven. As the Second Man or last Adam, He answers to the first man, of whose flesh we naturally partake, and by our partaking of it receive the sin and death which was in him. We receive sin by partaking of the human nature of the first Adam, through his flesh, which we receive at our birth with its taint of corruption, and through the flesh, the lower nature, we receive of Christ's higher nature. The link of communication between ourselves and Adam, is not spirit or soul, but flesh. So that it seems according to analogy of the two heads of the race, that we should receive in some way the Flesh of the Second Man, the Lord from heaven. It also seems that the communication of His Flesh requires means. The communication of Life from His Divine Nature direct would seem to require no outward means—indeed, to be intolerant of such things. The communication of Life from His reasonable Soul, of itself could only be in the way in which one soul communicates its thoughts to another—that is, by means of language, books, and such things. But if there be any proper meaning in the word "flesh," so that it is impossible to substitute for it "Godhead" or "Spirit," then a means seems to be required by which His Flesh may reach us: and this is emphasized by the fact that He gives us His Flesh, not for the life of our souls only, but for the eternal life of our

52 The Jews therefore [a] strove among themselves, saying,
[o] How can this man give us *his* flesh to eat?
53 Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily,

[a] ch. vii. 43. & ix. 16. & x. 19.
[o] ch. iii. 9.

---

bodies, for no less than four times in this discourse in connection with Christ as the Bread of Life, have we the words, "I will raise him up at the last day."

52. "The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" The words of the Jews do not seem to be the outcome of mere unbelief. Unbelief would, on such an occasion, have shown itself in scorn and contempt—in such words as, "He hath a devil, and is mad, why hear ye him?"

These words of the Son of God could at that time be understood by no living being. They could be received by implicit faith, as the Apostles received them, but understood they could not be, for to understand them implied the believing apprehension of Christ's holy Incarnation, as well as of His atoning Death, and His Resurrection in His spiritualized Body. To understand them implied that the Flesh of this Jesus, "whose father and mother they knew," was in some sense a necessity for every inhabitant of the world. No matter what explanation is given of them, they must mean that some sort of apprehension of the lower nature, the Flesh, of the Man before them was an antecedent to the Resurrection of each of their bodies at the last day.

No explanation such as would make His words intelligible could be given till after the Resurrection and the Ascension, and the day of Pentecost had come; and so the Lord proceeds to further enunciate the mystery in words which, like the former, could only be received in implicit faith, but which a short time after this would help those to whom God had given this faith, if not to a solution of the mystery, at least to a realization of the promise.

53. "Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." The mystery contained in the fifty-first verse is here repeated with the most important addition of the *Blood*. "Flesh" and "Blood" are the two lower elements of man's nature, and sometimes stand for human nature, to distinguish it from natures above it, such as that of the angels, which is purely spiritual.

I say unto you, Except [p] ye eat the flesh of the

[p] Matt. xxvi, 26, 28.

Flesh is the tenement in which man's intellectual nature resides, and which in this lower world is its instrument for making itself known, and Blood is in the Scriptures put for his animal life. ("The blood is the life," Deut. xii. 23.) So that here the Lord asserts that we are to receive Himself—the Living Bread, and with it the Resurrection of the body—not primarily through communion with His higher Nature, but through participation in His lower, and His lower Nature is "flesh and blood."

It will be needful to ask in passing, "Can flesh and blood stand for death, so that the Lord means that all we have to do is to realize His Death?" Impossible. Flesh and Blood never stand for death. On the contrary in every place where they occur together in the New Testament, they mean the living human being.[1] We of course do receive the Flesh and Blood of Christ in remembrance of His Death, but this we do, not to receive His Death, but His Life. Those who now heard Christ would understand the words of one living, not of one dead. Before we proceed to consider how this feeding is to be brought about, one or two matters must be noticed.

1. If our Lord meant by "flesh" and "blood" that part of our nature which is not mind and spirit (and He surely did so), then it is clearly wrong and dishonourable to Him to substitute for His Flesh and Blood His Mind or Spirit, or any element or product of His Spiritual Nature, such as His will, or love, or righteousness, or doctrine. Virtually, to substitute "spirit" or some product of "spirit" for "flesh," is to destroy all meaning of human language, for it is to assert that our Lord expressed a particular form of being by that which is most opposite to it, for no words in the range of human language can be more opposite than "flesh" and "spirit."

2. This assertion of Christ that, in order to have His Life, we are to eat His Flesh and drink His Blood, is the ultimate assertion of this wonderful discourse. All leads up to Himself as the Living Bread, and His giving us of Himself the Living Bread, not through His Spirit, but through His Flesh and Blood.

Now, if all leads up to this, the faith which is set forth through-

[1] Thus Matth. xvi. 7, "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee." Also 1 Cor. xv. 50; Gal. i. 16; Ephes. vi. 12; Heb. ii. 14.

Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.

---

out this discourse as the qualification, on our part, for eating the Bread of life, must ultimately, if it be a true implicit faith, such as that of the Apostles, fasten itself upon Christ giving to us His Flesh and Blood.

It must be a humble and devout faith, willing to receive Christ, not through His Godhead or His Spirit, but through His Flesh and Blood, the lower part of His lower nature.

If the Faith mentioned throughout this discourse has to do with the subject of this discourse, then it must follow Christ as He enunciates one deep truth after another, and receive each one, and not stop short till He comes to an end, which He does when He says, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you." If then our faith is to be what many call a "self-appropriating" faith, it must appropriate to itself what Christ here sets forth to be received, which is His Flesh and Blood.

And now we have to answer the question, Has our Lord provided any means, in the faithful use of which we can partake of His Flesh and Blood for the purposes set forth in this discourse?

The New Testament, taken by itself, would lead us to believe that the Flesh and Blood of Christ and the accompanying benefits are actually given to us in one ordinance, and in that alone; for in the references to that ordinance, and that only, have we the salient words of this discourse reproduced. This ordinance, of course, is the Eucharist or Breaking of Bread, which was ordained at the hour when Christ actually gave His Flesh and Blood, which was immolated within twenty-four hours after as a Sacrifice.

The words of Institution of the Eucharist and the words of St. Paul in 1 Cor. x. and xi. which refer to them, and are founded upon them, are the only passages in which there is any allusion to this eating of the Flesh and drinking of the Blood of the Son of Man. Christ is set before us in the rest of the New Testament in every possible relation of love to us. He is set forth as the Husband of the Church, its Head, its Shepherd, its Priest and Intercessor, above all its Life, but never as its Bread or its Food, except in connection with the Communion of His Body and Blood. Never is the reception of His doctrine, or the contemplation of His Goodness, or the abiding in His Body or Church, or trust in His Righteousness, called by such terms as "eating Him as the Living Bread," or

54 [q] Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.

[q] ver. 27, 40, 63. ch. iv. 14.

"eating His Flesh." So that if this discourse be not the setting forth of a blessing which it is the will of God that we should receive in the devout reception of the Eucharist, then its most salient words fall to the ground.

And the converse, if it may be so called, is equally true, that if the Eucharist be not the correlative and fulfilment of this discourse, then the Lord gave to the disciples the Eucharistic Food without a single word to prepare them for it. He said, "Take eat, this is my body," without a word to explain why they were to do such a thing as eat His Body.

How is it then that so many professed believers in Christ and in the Inspiration of Holy Scripture formally repudiate any connection worth speaking of between this discourse and the Eucharistic Rite? It cannot be because of the teaching of the New Testament, but simply because of the present state of the Church, or rather of one part of Christendom, in which it is supposed that many Christians have a realizing or self-appropriating faith in our Lord, altogether apart from Eucharistic Reception; and even the greater part of those who do receive Holy Communion, have no belief that it is anything more than a means of reminding ourselves of His Love. They look not for, and in many cases would repudiate, any benefit of a kind different from what they would receive by hearing a sermon on the Death of Christ.

But surely it is most perilous to make our own unbelief, or that of the majority of any particular age or part of the world, the measure of God's dealings. In the Pentecostal Church, and for centuries afterwards, there would be no difficulty, for every one who believed, we may say naturally, and as a matter of course, received the Eucharist; and if any one for the sake of discipline was debarred from it, it was considered both by the Church and by the man himself, if he had any faith or repentance, as tantamount to his separation from Christ.

But this and one or two other matters I shall examine more fully in an excursus.

54. "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day." In this verse the

55 For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.

55. "Meat indeed . . . . drink indeed" should be rendered, "truly meat" and "truly drink," or, if B., C., L., and most editors (including Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort) be followed, "true meat" and "true drink." ℵ. D., T., Δ, Λ, later Uncials, most Cursives, most Old Latin, Vulg., and all Syriac, read "truly" or "indeed."

Lord repeats with reference to eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood, what He had said in other parts of the discourse respecting the eating of the Bread of life. He had spoken in verse 27 of the meat that endureth unto everlasting life; in verse 32, of God giving men the true bread, *i.e.*, true in contrast with the Manna; in verse 39, of raising from the dead all that His Father had given to Him; in verse 40, of raising from the dead every one that "seeth the Son and believeth on Him;" in verse 44, of raising from the dead all that "were drawn to Him of the Father." Now He says of those that eat His Flesh and drink His Blood, that He will "raise them up at the last day." If then, according to common-sense, we are to interpret the former part of the discourse by that part to which it leads up, then when God gives to men the true Bread, He gives them the Flesh and Blood of His Son. Those whom He gives to His Son, He so draws to Him that they "eat His Flesh and drink His Blood;" and he that effectually "seeth the Son and believeth on Him," is led by God to "eat His Flesh and drink His Blood"—in other words to obey in a spirit of faith, and of loving and holy remembrance, His Son's last command.

If the discourse be one connected whole, the persons mentioned in these various verses as raised up at the last day must be the same, and be raised up because they partake of the same Living Bread with the same inward faith and, in ordinary circumstances, under the same outward forms.

55. "My flesh is meat indeed [or truly meat], and my blood is drink [or truly drink]. Here evidently verses 32 and 33 are referred to. "My Father giveth you the true bread from heaven." The reference is not so clear in our translation as in the original. My Flesh is truly meat, or, according to some MSS., "true" meat, answering to "My Father giveth you the true bread."

56. "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him." In this verse we have the first instance of that remarkable language which reappears in the latter part of the Gospel, and is dominant throughout St. Paul's Epistles, that there is, or can

56 He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, [r]dwelleth in me, and I him.

[r] 1 John iii. 24. & iv. 15, 16.

57 As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me.

---

56. D. has here a considerable addition. "As the Father in me, and I in the Father. Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye receive the Body of the Son of Man as the Bread of Life, ye have not life in Him." There is, however, no other authority worth speaking of for it.

57. By . . . by. "Because of" (Revisers); *propter patrem* –*propter me* (Vulg.).

be, a mutual indwelling between Christ and the Christian; Christ in the believer, and the believer in Christ. This is here first said by way of promise. But in chap. xv. it is declared to be in fulfilment, "I am the true vine, ye are the branches," "He that abideth in me and I in him," &c. The apostles in the latter chapters of this Gospel are repeatedly said to be "in Christ," and have to "abide in him." Now it is to be noticed that they are never said to be "in Christ" till they have received at His Hands the Sacrament of His Body and Blood, for their being "in" Christ is first said of the apostles in chap. xv., just after they had received it.

Again, the same truth is so constantly set forth in St. Paul's Epistles, that to be "in" Christ may not unfitly be described as the characteristic phrase of the Apostle. All the Christians to whom he writes are assumed to be "in Christ." But what is the pledge of this? The Apostle distinctly tells us that the means or pledge is sacramental. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the Blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the Body of Christ? For we being many are one bread and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread." (1 Cor. x. 16, 17.) How can the partaking of one bread [or, rather one loaf] make men in all parts of the earth one body, for the bread of each assembly is different, not only made of different grains, but sometimes of different sorts of grain? Only because it is not mere bread, but has an Inward Part which is always the same everywhere, being the Body of the Lord.

57. "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me." The true and faithful feeder on Christ lives morally, spiritually, and eternally by the Life of God Himself, the fountain of all life. For the Son lives

58 [s]This is that bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead: he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever.

[s] ver. 49, 50, 51.

58. "Your fathers;" perhaps, "*the* fathers" (א, B., C., L.); but Vulgate and Syriac, and most other authorities, as in A. V.

"Manna" omitted by א, B., C., D., L., and some versions; retained by later Uncials; all Cursives except 33, Old Latin, Vulg. and Syriac.

by the Life communicated to Him by the Father, and he who effectually partakes of Christ, lives by the same life communicated to him through the Flesh and Blood of the Son.

58. "This is that bread which came down from heaven . . . live for ever." The Lord ends with an assertion which binds the whole discourse together as having one meaning, and referring to one thing. "The bread which cometh down from heaven (v. 33), which is infinitely above that which "your fathers" did eat (v. 32), which will endue the eater with such life that he will live for ever, is that which I have in Myself, in My Flesh and Blood, set before you."

Such is this discourse, dealing with the greatest mystery next to that of the Godhead itself, even the communication of the human nature of Christ to all in Him. We of the Church of England have by God's mercy and grace an authoritative guide in this matter, for we have an Eucharistic service which very plainly identifies the mysterious Blessing of this discourse with that which God intends us to receive in the Eucharist. The Church of England teaches that God the Father hath given His Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, "not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance in that Holy Sacrament:" she teaches us that "the benefit is great if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that Holy Sacrament, for then we spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood—we dwell in Christ and Christ in us." (John vi. 56.) "We are one with Christ, and Christ with us." (1 Cor. x. 16, 17.) In the prayer of humble access just before the consecration, we pray that we may "so eat the flesh [the special term of John vi.] of the Son of Man and drink his blood . . . that we may evermore dwell in him and he in us." Each element is separately given, on the faith of our Lord's promise, that those who eat His Flesh and drink His Blood have "eternal life, and he will raise them up at the last day," for they are given to us with the

59 These things said he in the synagogue, as he taught in Capernaum.

---

words, "the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . the Blood of our Lord . . . preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life." Again, we thank God, after receiving, that He doth feed us with "the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood," and "doth assure us thereby that we are very members incorporate in the mystical Body of His Son," thereby claiming the words of our Lord in verse 56, and the doctrine of St. Paul in 1 Cor. x. 16, 17, as referring to the Eucharistic participation. And what is very striking indeed as to the mind of the Church of England, the wise and merciful words of the rubric at the end of the Sick Communion Office, respecting spiritual feeding being accepted by God where actual Eucharistic partaking is impossible, prove the rule whilst laying down the exception: "But if a man, by reason of extremity of sickness, . . . or by any other just impediment, do not receive the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood . . . if he do truly and earnestly repent him of his sins, and steadfastly believe that Jesus Christ hath suffered death upon the cross for him . . . he doth eat and drink the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth." So that there cannot be the smallest doubt as to the mind of the Church of England with respect to the direct reference of this discourse to the Eucharist.

If the thought occurs to us, as it seems to occur to many, that it is unworthy of God to give us some great spiritual gift under so lowly a guise as an outward rite, let us remember that the Holy Eucharist is not an outward rite but a Sacrament, and so the outward part or sign of an Inward Part, which Christ Himself has joined to it; that it was given to us by Christ when He gave Himself as the true Passover Lamb for us; and, above all, that it is the Sacrament of the Unity of the Mystical Body. It is undoubtedly the design of God that we should receive the blessings of Redemption, not as separate units only, but as members of a Mystical Body or Fellowship, and it seems consonant to this that we should receive these blessings in the devout and faithful reception of that Sacrament which assures us that we are in that unity.

59. "These things said he in the synagogue, as he taught in Capernaum." "These things" must mean this whole discourse, for

60 [t] Many therefore of his disciples, when they had heard *this,* said, This is an hard saying; who can hear it?

[t] ver. 66. Matt. xi. 6.

61 When Jesus knew in himself that his disciples murmured at it, he said unto them, Doth this offend you?

62 [u] *What* and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?

[u] Mark xvi. 19. ch. iii. 13. Acts i. 9. Eph. iv. 8.

---

60. "Hard saying;" *i.e.* the saying respecting eating His Flesh. It refers to the culminating words of the discourse, at which alone they stumbled.

"Hear it;" perhaps, "hear *him;*" *quis potest eum audire?* (Vulg.)

62. "What and if," &c. This may be paraphrased, "If then ye see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before, what will ye think? how much more will ye be offended?" See below.

there is not the slightest hint of any break in it. The Jews who, in verse 25, found Him, would have very probably found Him in the Synagogue, where it was His constant habit to preach and teach, and where the teaching was often interrupted by questions.

60. "Many therefore of his disciples . . . hard saying; who can hear it?" Here we have the unbelief extending to the circle of the disciples—not, of course, to the twelve. They felt it to be a hard saying, and they stumbled at it. This was natural, but not the less foolish and sinful; for if they had been His disciples in very deed, they must have accepted Him as the Messiah. But it was folly to accept a man as specially sent from God as the Messiah, Who was to be the fulfilment of a long series of promises, and to question His words. If they believed Him to have "come from God," the only faith worthy of Him was implicit, unquestioning faith. They might have known that an ambassador coming direct from the Eternal and Infinite God was likely to declare things far above them, and they might have waited His time for the solution.

61. "When Jesus knew in himself . . . Doth this offend you?" From this we gather that these half-believing disciples murmured in, or among, themselves, instead of coming to Him to remove any difficulty then capable of explanation, and so help them to believe. On another occasion, the true disciples who believed implicitly had come to Him with the prayer, "Lord, increase our faith." And these should have done the same.

62. "What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?" This could be taken, and was possibly intended to be

63 [x] It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh [x] 2 Cor. iii. 6.

---

taken, in one of two ways—first, as showing those who took the gross and carnal view (viz., that the Lord meant that His Flesh was to be eaten as any other flesh is eaten), that the belief in any such view would be rendered impossible by His Ascension. If He ascended into heaven, His Body could not be given and eaten naturally; and so they must either take a better and higher view, or cease to be His disciples at all.

But to those who had any belief that He spake of heavenly and spiritual realities, it would be a help, for it would exalt the whole matter into a higher sphere, and render that possible to be received by faith which never could be apprehended by sight. As long as Christ continued on earth men never would be able to realize Him as able, as the last Adam, to enter into the closest union with every man. He must first ascend into heaven in a spiritualized and glorified Body, if men are, in any spiritual way, to partake of His Nature as the Second Man.

63. "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing." It is impossible that the Lord can here intend to undo all that He had said before. Why should He have said, "the bread that I will give is my Flesh," if His Flesh in no sense profits? There is a noble passage in St. Augustine, which seems to leave nothing to be desired in the way of explanation: "Let us say to Him, O Lord, good Master, how is it that the Flesh profiteth nothing, when Thou hast said, Except a man shall eat my Flesh, and drink my Blood, he shall not have life in him? Doth life profit nothing? And for what are we what we are, but that we may have life eternal, which Thou, by Thy Flesh, dost promise? Then what is 'the Flesh profiteth nothing?' Profiteth nothing; yea, but as they understood it: for they understood the Flesh, so as it is divided piecemeal in a dead body, or as sold in the shambles, not so as it is quickened by the Spirit. Therefore, 'the flesh profiteth nothing,' is said in like manner as it is said, *knowledge puffeth up*. Ought we then straightway to hate knowledge? God forbid. And what is *knowledge puffeth up?* Of itself, without charity. Add, then, to knowledge charity, and knowledge shall be profitable, not through itself, but through charity. So, likewise now, 'the flesh profiteth nothing,' yea, but the Flesh by itself; let the Spirit be added to the Flesh, as charity is added to knowledge, and it profiteth very

profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, *they* are spirit, and *they* are life.

---

63. "I speak;" rather, "have spoken." So ℵ, B., C., D., K., L., U., Π, fifteen Cursives, old Latin, Vulg., and Syriac (Cureton and Peshito), and most editors; but most later Uncials and Cursives as in Received Text. (A. wanting.)

much. For if the Flesh profiteth nothing, the Word had not been made Flesh, that It might dwell in us. If by means of the Flesh Christ hath much profited us, how profited the Flesh nothing? But the Flesh was the means whereby the Spirit acted for our salvation. The Flesh was a vessel: mark what it *had*, not what it *was*" . . . and he concludes "so as those Jews understood the flesh, not so give I my Flesh to be eaten."

"The Flesh," Augustine says, "was the means." Christ offers to us the elements of His lower Nature of flesh, that through them we might partake of His higher Nature, His spiritual and eternal life. Godet, who takes by no means a sacramental view of the whole discourse, has here a valuable remark: "The Event of Pentecost was the reality which Jesus, throughout this discourse, was promising: it was by means of the Spirit that the promises (53-58) would be realized. This explains the singular analogy between the terms of verse 56 and those of chapter xiv.-xviii. Only that we may not attribute to the explanation given by Jesus the character of a retractation, we must remember that our Lord, by communicating Himself to us by the agency of His Spirit, INCORPORATES US INTO HIS WHOLE NATURE. St. Paul develops in the same sense the idea of the Second Adam as 'a quickening Spirit.' (1 Cor. xv. 45.) But it is not merely the identical expression 'quickening' (or life-giving) 'Spirit' which connects these passages (John vi. and 1 Cor. xv.), but especially that corporeal resurrection to which Jesus so frequently recurs in this address, and which is the principal subject of this chapter of St. Paul."

"The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." The Lord does not mean *any* words of His, though all His words tend to Life and Salvation, but He means the particular words which He had spoken in the discourse now brought to a close: according to the best reading, "I have spoken," not "I speak."

But the words which He means are not words striking on the outward ear, but words received, believed, and devoutly pondered. The meaning seems to be this: The Flesh of Christ, whether given

64 But [y] there are some of you that believe not. For [z] Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray him.

[y] ver. 36.
[z] ch. ii. & xiii. 11.

---

in the Eucharist, or (exceptionally) out of it, cannot be received by a man spiritually dead or an unbeliever. There must be, at least, the beginning of life in the human subject, for food cannot be given to a corpse, but to one who has some life to receive it and digest it. And the words of Christ in this discourse give spirit and life to the soul, because, if faithfully received, they will excite the soul to desire the living Bread, and to believe that that bread is given in the way which Christ has here set forth, not through the communication of His higher nature, but through the partaking of His lower, His human nature, in its lower elements of flesh and blood.

The promise of this discourse is the reception of Christ's Life through His Flesh and Blood. The words of Christ are not Flesh and Blood, but if received devoutly and with implicit faith, they will give life to the soul, so that it has power to receive the Flesh of Christ to salvation.

So that many commentators (learned and Christian men though they be) know not what they do when they separate this discourse from the Eucharist, and deny its reference to the most sacred Thing there offered to our acceptance: for in any eating of Christ's Flesh, or of what is given to us as the Sacrament of His Flesh, these particular words of Christ, and no other, must be apprehended if we would eat and drink worthily, discerning the Lord's Body.

We of the Church of England (as I have shown) have the inestimable advantage or having our souls fixed on these words, when we approach the Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood. The words of Christ here, respecting receiving His Flesh and Blood, and the words of Institution as recorded in the Gospels, are the instruments of the Spirit, whereby He quickens our desires after the heavenly Food, and fastens our faith on the Consecrated Elements as the ordained Medium of its conveyance.

64. "But there are some of you that believe not." What is this "believing not?" Evidently not believing in the words which Christ had been uttering, and, if not believing in His *words*, not really believing in Him.

"Jesus knew from the beginning," &c. Jesus from the beginning

65 And he said, Therefore [a] said I unto you, that no man
[a] ver. 44, 45. can come unto me, except it were given unto him
of my Father.

[b] ver. 60. 66 ¶ [b] From that *time* many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him.

---

66. "From that time;" rather, "Upon this." So Alford and Revisers:—"Upon their hearing these last words of this discourse."

of His words was reading the hearts of all around Him, the hearts of His enemies, of His professed disciples, and of His real disciples. He watched the effect of His words, and He saw how first they stumbled at one thing, then at another, and that there was one who, whilst still adhering to the little company of implicit believers, would even betray him.

65. "And he said, Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come unto me," &c. Are these words like former similar words said in condemnation, or in mitigation? We have more difficulty in answering this question now than before, for Jesus now contemplates the falling away, not of the multitude, but of disciples, disciples who had even hitherto "walked" with Him. And yet they may be taken as said in mitigation, as we believe the former were. Just as none could come to Christ and believe in Him at all without being led by God, so especially was it with those who had a simple, childlike, implicit, and enduring faith: such as, notwithstanding all drawbacks, the twelve, or rather the eleven, had. These were the peculiar gift of God to His Son, to be, not only His disciples, but His representatives, and the founders of His Church. But such were few, very few indeed, and intended by God to be very few, because it was the design of God to build His Church not upon the many, but upon a very few.

66. "From that time many of his disciples went back, and walked no more," &c. From this we gather that, besides the twelve, there were other disciples who might be said to "walk" with Him. Such were those who are mentioned in Acts i. 21, as having "companied" with Jesus and the Apostles. Does this "walking no more" indicate final apostasy? I think not. The demands made on the faith, the devotion, and the self-denial of the twelve were very great, and they required a very special keeping on Christ's part; so great that He mentions it to His Father in the great Intercession, as if He had

67 Then said Jesus unto the twelve, Will ye also go away?

68 Then Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? thou [c] hast the words of eternal life.

69 [d] And we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God.

[c] Acts v. 20.

[d] Matt. xvi. 16. Mark viii. 29. Luke ix. 20. ch. i. 49. & xi. 27.

---

67. "Will ye also?" *i.e.* "Desire ye also to go away?" *numquid et vos vultis abire?*

69. "We believe and are sure." "We have believed and know" (Alford and Revisers); *credidimus* (Vulg.).

"Thou art that Christ;" rather, "*the* Christ."

Instead of, "the Christ, the Son of the living God," ℵ, B., C., D., L., read, "Thou art the Holy One of God;" but the Vulgate, both Syriacs (Cureton and Peshito), most later Uncials and Cursives, and most versions, read as in Authorized; Vulg. omits "living." Either expression denotes the closest relation of Christ to God as demanding the most implicit faith.

fulfilled it as a special task laid upon Him [xvii. 12]. We trust that after Pentecost some of these might be brought into the Church.

67. "Then said Jesus unto the twelve, Will ye also go away?" There is a touching appeal in these words, as if many were deserting, and He felt that it could only be strong personal feeling which would retain the twelve. "Will ye—ye who have known Me so well, seen all My life, heard all explanations of hard sayings—will ye at at once require to know all, and take nothing on My word?"

68. "Then Simon Peter answered him . . . . words of eternal life." He had revealed to them themselves. He had given to them some glimpses of His own greatness, and of the wondrous things He had in store for the world and for the Church. They could not go back. They must go to some one. "To whom shall we go? Who is like unto Thee? Thou hast the words of Eternal Life." Here, again, notice the correspondence between their faith and what Christ had just taught. He had summed up with, "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life," and they re-echoed this, "Thou hast the words of Eternal Life, as Thou hast said."

69. "And we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God." This is parallel to St. Peter's and their confession in Matth. xvi. 16, and is a confession of their faith in what He has said throughout this discourse, of the Father being His Father, of His having been given by God from heaven, of His being "of God" and having "seen the Father." This was the

70 Jesus answered them, [e]Have not I chosen you twelve,
[e] Luke vi. 13.
[f] ch. xiii. 27.
[f]and one of you is a devil.

71 He spake of Judas Iscariot *the son* of Simon: for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve.

---

70. "You twelve;" rather, "you the twelve."

71. "Judas Iscariot the son of Simon." B., C., G., L., 33, Vulg. (Col. Amiat.), read, "Judas the son of Simon Iscariot;" but later Uncials, and almost all Cursives, as in Received Text.

ground of their implicit faith. It was with them the first principle of all, that if God sent His own very Son they must receive and believe His every word. Such is implicit faith. It is not unreasoning, but it acknowledges a Supreme Reason which alone knows all needs and sees things as they are; and this Reason was no other than the Logos, now before them.

70. "Jesus answered them, Have I not chosen you twelve, and one of you," &c. We shall, hereafter, enter into the deep mystery of the choosing of Judas, and what is revealed respecting the foreknowledge of his treachery.

CHAP. VII.

AFTER these things Jesus walked in Galilee: for he

In the two following chapters (vii. and viii.) we have the Lord's visit to Jerusalem at the time of the Feast of Tabernacles, about six months after the Passover Season in which he had delivered the discourse in the synagogue in Capernaum.

These chapters are mainly occupied with a discourse which is virtually a continuation of that recorded in chap. v., and which, notwithstanding many interruptions and digressions, maintains throughout a certain unity of thought and purpose.

This discourse is of the same character as many, if not all, of our Lord's utterances in this Gospel. It is wholly from the Divine

would not walk in Jewry, [a] because the Jews sought to kill him.

[a] ch. v. 16, 18.

1. "In Jewry." "In Judæa." As precisely the same word is translated by the usual word Judæa in verse 3, it is difficult to understand how the translators of 1611 retained this word.

standpoint, and so is addressed to implicit faith. The Lord speaks here, as in chapters iv., v., vi., as the "Verbum caro factum," the Eternal Son, Who is in the bosom of the Father. I cannot see, with many commentators, that the astonishing sayings of Jesus which are preserved in these chapters, are related for the purpose of revealing the progress of faith and unbelief side by side in the people of Jerusalem or their rulers. The contents of the discourse, the things which the Lord in them says of Himself, are more than sufficient to account for their being brought by the Spirit to the remembrance of the Evangelist, and recorded by him for the purpose of establishing the faith of the Church. Consider some of the things which Christ here says of Himself. "I go unto Him that sent Me." "He that believeth on me, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water." "I am the light of the world." "I know whence I came and whither I go." "Ye are from beneath, I am from above." "If ye believe not that I am He, ye shall die in your sins." "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see My day." "Before Abraham was, I am." Such a discourse making known such things must have been revealed for its own sake, and not for the purpose of recording the fluctuations in the faith or unbelief of the inhabitants of Jerusalem.

Of course such assertions called forth opposition and anger in all who had not implicit faith in Him as the Sent of God: but it was far better that they should manifest opposition and wrath than indifference and contempt. The opposition, like that of Saul of Tarsus, might, after the Son of man was lifted up, be changed into loving discipleship, but indifference is more hopeless, more insolent, and in the case of our Lord's countrymen must have arisen from a more callous or utterly frivolous state of moral feeling.

1. "After these things Jesus walked . . . because the Jews sought to kill him." By this He showed His people an example that they are not rashly to court danger, but rather avoid it, unless to face it is clearly in the path of duty.

2 [b] Now the Jews' feast of tabernacles was at hand.

[b] Lev. xxiii. 34.

3 [c] His brethren therefore said unto him, Depart hence, and go into Judæa, that thy disciples also may see the works that thou doest.

[c] Matt. xii. 46. Mark iii. 21. Acts i. 14

4 For *there is* no man *that* doeth any thing in secret, and he himself seeketh to be known openly. If thou do these things, shew thyself to the world.

5 For [d] neither did his brethren believe in him.

[d] Mark iii. 21.

---

2 Translated by the Revisers at last: "Now the feast of the Jews, the feast of Tabernacles was at hand." This rendering is made avowedly for the purpose of exalting the Feast of Tabernacles above other feasts, particularly the Passover. If any distinction is made, it should be rendered: "Now there was at hand the feast of the Jews, the Skenopegia," *i.e.* the Tabernacle one. The article in the Greek merely indicates which of the National Festivals it was, not emphasizing it as the feast of the Jews, to the disparagement of others.

5. "Neither;" rather, "not even" (Alford and Revisers).

2. "Now the Jews' feast of tabernacles was at hand." Or, feast of In-gathering. One of the three great feasts—apparently called by Josephus the greatest—but the Passover, both from the nature of the deliverance it commemorates, and from the far greater deliverance which it foreshadows, must of necessity be accounted the greatest. From Josephus' own account there must have been a vastly greater number of strangers in the city at the latter feast than at the former. If the Jews made this feast their greatest one, it was another sign of their deep degradation in preferring the mere animal joy of this feast before the deeply religious associations of the Passover, because, no doubt, of the greater convenience of the latter. The Lord evidently gives by far the greater honour to the Passover. The ritual of the feast is to be found in Numbers xxix. 12-40.

3, 4, 5. "His brethren therefore . . . no man that doeth anything in secret . . . believe in him." When it is said that His brethren did not believe in Him, it is not meant that they did not believe that His miracles were real, or that such signs did not signify that He was in some sense a messenger from God; but what they expected was a Messiah of this world, from whom, as His brethren, they should receive worldly advancement. They could understand an

6 Then Jesus said unto them, [d] My time is not yet come but your time is alway ready.

7 [e] The world cannot hate you; but me it hateth, [f] because I testify of it, that the works thereof are evil.

[d] ch. ii. 4. & viii. 20. ver. 8, 30.
[e] ch. xv. 19.
[f] ch. iii. 19.

---

ambitious and self-asserting Messiah, but not One Who did mighty works in secret, and earnestly bade men "tell them to no man," and Who preferred to preach in Galilee and Peræa, and rather avoided Jerusalem, the centre of national and ecclesiastical life; and so they wavered respecting His claims, but above all things, they would have Him commit Himself to pretensions from which they hoped they might gain something.

Of course these men were not His uterine brothers, for, if so, it is impossible to conceive why, at His crucifixion, He should have committed His mother to the care of a comparative stranger, as St. John was, when it was the duty of her own children to provide her with a home.

6. "Then Jesus said unto them, My time is not yet come: but your time is alway ready. The world cannot," &c. Some have thought that the "time" here signifies the opportune time, the exact time for visiting Jerusalem, if not in safety, yet, at least, at a juncture when the minds of the multitude were less excited about Him than they seem to have been at the commencement of the feast.

"My time [for going up] is not yet come: but yours is alway ready. The world cannot hate you." This need not have been said in reproof of their worldliness or sinfulness, but simply as meaning that they had not put themselves forward to bear testimony against it as He had, having no direct call to do so. There may be, however, a deeper and further meaning. "My time for publicly asserting Myself and letting men see My works, will not be at this feast. It will be at a more solemn one, when the time shall have come for Me to depart out of this world to the Father." Thus Augustine: "They were giving Him counsel of getting glory, as in a worldly sort, and with earthly affection, advising Him that He should not remain unrenowned and hiding out of the way; this then that the Lord said in answer, 'My time is not yet come.' He said to them as [those who were] giving Him counsel respecting glory, 'The time of My glory is not yet come . . . He would pre-

8 Go ye up unto this feast: I go not up yet unto this
[h] ch. viii. 20. ver. 6. feast: [h] for my time is not yet full come.

9 When he had said these words unto them, he abode *still* in Galilee.

10 ¶ But when his brethren were gone up, then went he also up unto the feast, not openly, but as it were in secret.

[i] ch. xi. 56. 11 Then [i] the Jews sought him at the feast, and said, Where is he?

[k] ch. ix. 16. & x. 19. 12 And [k] there was much murmuring among

---

8. "This." The word "this" doubtful. Omitted by B., D., K., L., old Latin, and Egyptian versions; inserted by later Uncials, Vulg., and Syriacs.

"Yet" omitted by ℵ, D., K., M., old Latin, Vulg., Syriac, &c.; inserted by B., L., later Uncials, some old Latin.

vent highness by lowliness, and to very loftiness pave the way by humility."

8. "Go ye up . . . I go not up [yet] . . . my time is not yet full come." If the word "yet" is genuine, this means that the time appointed to Him by the Father was not yet full come, but would shortly be. If it be not genuine, then the most probable signification is, that Jesus, obeying the secret intimation of His Father, would not go up to that feast to keep it, as the rest of the Jews did; but, if He went up, would go to Jerusalem as a stranger might, to bear testimony to those there assembled, without taking part in their festal worship.

9, 10. "When he had said these words, he abode . . . but as it were in secret." Not openly, *i.e.*, not in one of the caravans or companies of pilgrims, but (as it were) in secret, probably not attended with the usual number of the disciples.

11. "Then the Jews sought him," &c. The Jews here are, no doubt, the ruling party of the Sanhedrim, mostly Pharisees, who sought Him for an evil purpose. Their conduct and its motive is the same as that mentioned in chapter v. 18, where it is said that "The Jews sought to kill him." They could do no more. Enmity such as that evinced in chapter v. could not be well increased or developed, though it might find better opportunities for accomplishing its purpose.

12. "And there was much murmuring among the people." It was in all probability the manifestation of this difference of opinion

the people concerning him: for [l] some said, He is a good man: others said, Nay; but he deceiveth the people.

13 Howbeit no man spake openly of him [m] for fear of the Jews.

14 ¶ Now about the midst of the feast Jesus went up into the temple, and taught.

15 [n] And the Jews marvelled, saying, How knoweth this man || letters, having never learned?

16 Jesus answered them, and said, [o] My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me.

[l] Matt. xxi. 46. Luke vii. 16. ch. vi. 14. ver. 40.

[m] ch. ix. 22. & xii. 42. & xix. 38.

[n] Matt. xiii. 54. Mark vi. 2. Luke iv. 22 Acts ii. 7.

|| Or, *learning*

[o] ch. iii. 11. & viii. 28. & xii. 49. & xiv. 10, 24.

---

which made the Jews see that it might be dangerous to apprehend Him; and so the Lord, after this, knew that He might speak openly, and proceeded to do so.

13. "Howbeit no man spake openly of him for fear of the Jews." Lest they should be put out of the synagogue (chap. ix. 22).

14. "Now about the midst of the feast . . . . the Jews marvelled . . . . never learned." The Lord taught in the Temple with that astonishing wisdom and power which made the officers who were sent to apprehend Him say, "Never man spake like this man," and it excited the wonder and admiration even of the "Jews." Being many of them Scribes, Doctors of the law, Pharisees, and Rabbis, such as Gamaliel, they were the better able to judge of the knowledge of Scripture, and power of application, and fertility of illustration which he displayed. Could it be that any of the older among them remembered the child of about twelve years of age at whose "understanding and answers," some twenty years before, they were so amazed? But such knowledge was to them as a miracle, for He had never "learned." He had never sat at the feet of any of their Rabbis, or attended their schools. Jesus, however, leaves them in no doubt as to the true source of all that He taught. It came direct from His Father.

16. "Jesus answered them, and said, My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." In these and the following words the reader will notice that the Lord carries on the discourse of chap. v. just where he had concluded it, as if no Galilean ministry of considerable length or teaching in the synagogue of Capernaum had

17 [p] If any man will do his will, he shall know of the
[p] ch. viii. 43. doctrine, whether it be of God, or *whether* I speak of myself.

[q] ch. v. 41. & viii. 50. 18 [q] He that speaketh of himself seeketh his own glory: but he that seeketh his glory that

---

17. "Will do;" *i.e.* "willeth to do;" *voluerit voluntatem ejus facere* (Vulg.). "Of myself." More properly, "from myself" (Revisers); *a me ipso* (Vulg.)

intervened. Just as in chap. v. He had said that He did nothing of Himself, He judged nothing, or no one, of Himself, and He witnessed not to Himself, so here He sets forth that His teaching or doctrine is not from Himself. And then He proceeds to reproduce the thoughts of the latter part of the discourse of chap. v., respecting not receiving glory from men, only the allusion is unfortunately not clear to the English reader, because in the authorized version the same word is rendered "honour" in v. 41, and "glory" in vii. 18. Then in verses 22 and 23 He alludes to the former charge that He had broken the Sabbath, and shows its futility by the administration of circumcision on the eighth day after birth, though that day be the Sabbath. So that, in point of fact, the discourse in chap. vii. is a continuation and supplement of that in chap. v., and its interruptions on the part of the Jews show us how the higher teaching of the Eternal Word was misapprehended and rejected because not received in perfect faith.

17. "If any man will [or willeth] to do his will, he shall know of," &c. This follows on the former verse. If Christ's doctrine be the Father's, then he who is most in accord with God—that is, he who is desirous to do the will of God—will be most ready to receive it. Our authorized version is very unfortunate in conveying the Lord's meaning by reason that it does not here, as in many other cases, render distinctly the Greek verb "to will." If any man willeth, *i.e.*, is really desirous or determined to do His will—if the man, by reason of the frailty of his nature, is unable actually and perfectly to do the will of God, yet, if he *wills* to do the will of God, he will be accepted, and taught of the truth of Christ's mission.

18. "He that speaketh of himself seeketh his own glory: but he that," &c. The Lord's words here may be true of all teaching, of what a man supposes to be his own, elaborated from his own mind,

sent him, the same is true, and no unrighteousness is in him.

19 [r] Did not Moses give you the law, and *yet* none of you keepeth the law? [s] Why go ye about to kill me?

[r] Ex. xxiv. 3. Deut. xxxiii. 4. John i. 17. Acts vii. 38.
[s] Matt. xii. 14. Mark iii. 6. ch. v. 16, 18. & x. 31, 39. & xi. 53.

---

and which is given out to be his own. The thoughts of such an one must centre on himself. The self-complacency which leads him to suppose that he is the sole original author of some truth will pursue him in his enunciation of it, so that he will desire all the credit of it. Not so with the Son of God. He absolutely disclaims what men call originality. He desires to be considered simply as the image and representation of His Father, and to deliver faithfully what He has received. Godet has a very good remark: "Verse 18 has the appearance of a general maxim; but the application of it by Jesus to Himself is very clear. To understand this reasoning, we have only to apply it to the Bible in general: in this book God, and God only, is glorified from the first page to the last. In this book man is constantly humbled; therefore this book is of God. It is the argument which, of all others, most directly reaches the conscience."

"There is no unrighteousness in him." This is true in its degree of every faithful deliverer of a message which he has received from another to deliver intact. In such a man there is no double-dealing, no concealment, no withholding of that which he is bound to deliver, through fear of losing popularity or destroying his credit with his party.

13. "Did not Moses give you the law . . . go ye about to kill me?" This may be taken in one of two ways. Either as accusing them of not being willing to do the will of God, and so of not only rejecting Him, but of seeking His Life. The will of God was set forth in the law of Moses, and yet none of them kept that law. They universally made it void by their traditions; and now they were going about to compass the death of an innocent man. What right had such persons, who observed neither the spirit nor even the letter of their law, to make their boast of Moses, and to glory in the mere possession of that which condemned them?

The second way has reference to verses 22 and 23, and may be

20 The people answered and said, [t] Thou hast a devil: who goeth about to kill thee?

[t] ch. viii. 48, 52. & x. 20.

21 Jesus answered and said unto them, I have done one work, and ye all marvel.

22 [u] Moses therefore gave unto you circumcision: (not because it is of Moses, [x] but of the fathers;) and ye on the sabbath day circumcise a man.

[u] Lev. xii. 3.

[x] Gen. xvii. 10.

---

22. "Therefore" omitted by Tischendorf on the sole authority of ℵ.

expressed thus: Moses gave you the law, and yet ye of set purpose disobey the law of the Sabbath in the matter of circumcision, for if the eighth day after a male child is born happens to be the Sabbath, ye circumcise him, notwithstanding the law of doing no work on the Sabbath. If ye then make a precept of the decalogue yield to an older law delivered to the fathers long before, why do ye blame Me because I, by a single word, made a man "every whit whole on the Sabbath?" If the law of the fathers is older than the law of the decalogue concerning the Sabbath, and so takes precedence of it, the law of mercy is older still. Probably there is a reference to the pain of circumcision and the trouble which its administration would cause in any household. "If ye, on the Sabbath, perform a rite which requires the infliction of pain in the cutting off of a part of the body, and the shedding of blood, why are ye angry with me because, by a single word, accompanied with no pain or trouble whatsoever, I made a man perfectly whole on the Sabbath?"

20. "The people answered and said, Thou hast a devil: who goeth," &c. The mass of the people then standing around Him were ignorant of the murderous designs of the leaders, and so took these words as said to them, and accused our Lord of madness—"Thou hast a devil;" just as elsewhere they say, "He hath a devil, and is mad," most cases of lunacy being put down to possession by evil spirits.

21. "Jesus answered and said unto them, I have done one work, and," &c. This verse is important, as showing the deep and lasting impression which the healing by the pool of Bethesda had made on the people. The impression was deepened by the accusation of the Jews that it was done on the Sabbath, and by the discourse which arose out of it, which brought on our Lord the charge of blasphemy. The word translated "therefore" might be rendered

23 If a man on the sabbath day receive circumcision, ‖ that the law of Moses should not be broken; are ye angry at me, because [y] I have made a man every whit whole on the sabbath day?

‖ Or, *without breaking the law of Moses*

[y] ch. v. 8, 9, 16.

24 [z] Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment.

[z] Deut. i. 16, 17. Prov. xxiv. 23. ch. viii. 15. James ii. 1.

"on account of this," and be taken as belonging to the former verse, "Ye all marvel on account of this." But though this gets rid of a difficulty, it does so at the expense of a better and more probable, though not so obvious, meaning. "On account of this, *i.e.*, to teach you that a lower law must yield to a higher one, Moses, from whom you received the first definite precept respecting keeping the Sabbath, gave you the covenant rite of circumcision, not as being his own, but taking up an older ordinance of God. Both, then, stand on his authority—both are embodied in his law; but ye, my accusers, rightly make the one yield to the other, and this was God's intention, in giving circumcision through Moses, that ye should make the lesser precept, even in His law, yield to the greater." Circumcision, and with it the mode and day of administering it is, in one respect, far greater than the Sabbath, because it is the sign and seal of that covenant of which the Sabbath observance is only a part. The law of circumcision was, in one respect, the first of all laws, because it made a Jew a partaker of the covenant of Abraham, and brought him into God's family, so that he might be a "debtor to keep the whole law. In what I have done, then, in making a man by a single word whole on the Sabbath, I have asserted a principle contained, by designed implication, in your own law, that one law may yield to another, and so ye have no reason to be angry with Me because I have made the law of mercy supersede all other laws."

24. "Judge not according to the appearance," &c., that is, superficially, as you do if, on hearing of My having healed a man on the Sabbath, ye condemn Me without asking how I did it. But "judge righteous judgment," judge fairly and equitably, remembering that by your own law, the law of the Sabbath's rest must yield to the law of God's covenant with your fathers, and much more to God's law of mercy.

25 Then said some of them of Jerusalem, Is not this he, whom they seek to kill?

26 But, lo, he speaketh boldly, and they say nothing unto him. [a] Do the rulers know indeed that this is the very Christ?

[a] ver. 48.

27 [b] Howbeit we know this man whence he is: but when Christ cometh, no man knoweth whence he is.

[b] Matt. xiii. 55. Mark vi. 3. Luke iv. 22.

---

26. "Do the rulers know indeed?" "Have the rulers come to know indeed?" &c. (Alf.). "Can it be that the rulers indeed know?" (Revisers).

25, 26. "Then said some of them of Jerusalem . . . the very Christ." "Some of them of Jerusalem," *i.e.*, citizens of the holy city, and not merely pilgrims come from a distance to keep the feast. Such men would be more familiar with the designs of the rulers against the Lord's life.

"Is not this he, whom they seek to kill? But, lo, he speaketh boldly, and they say nothing unto him." The next clause should be rendered, Have the rulers come to know indeed that this man is the Christ? for such is the meaning of the question. If they had, by some means, found out that this is the Christ, they would, of course allow Him to speak thus openly, not otherwise.

27. "Howbeit we know this man whence he is." They thought they knew all about the origin and extraction of Jesus. Is not this Jesus, Whose father and mother we know? They knew, as they supposed, His family and native town, knowing that He had worked under Joseph, and spent all His youth in Nazareth.

"But when Christ cometh," &c. There were many prophecies which set forth the mysterious origin of the Messiah, as particularly, Isaiah liii. 8, "Who shall declare his generation?" and even the prophecy which named the place of His birth, speaks of "his goings forth having been from old, of everlasting" (Micah v. 2). The words are taken by many commentators as referring to an ancient tradition of the Jews that the Messiah, after having been born in Bethlehem, would live in concealment till His anointing by Elias, and would then be manifest: which tradition seems to have been founded on true prophecy, but in what sense true they knew not.

28 Then cried Jesus in the temple as he taught, saying, [c]Ye both know me, and ye know whence I am: and [d]I am not come of myself, but he that sent me [e]is true, [f]whom ye know not.

29 But [g]I know him: for I am from him, and he hath sent me.

[c] See chap. viii. 14.
[d] ch. v. 43. & viii. 42.
[e] ch. v. 32. & viii. 26. Rom iii. 4.
[f] ch. i. 18. & viii. 55.
[g] Matt. xi. 27. ch. x. 15.

---

29. "But" omitted by B., L., later Uncials, some old Latin, Vulg.: retained by ℵ. D., some old Latin and Syriac (Peshito and Cureton).

28. "Then cried Jesus in the temple as he taught, saying, Ye both know me," &c. That is to say, as Augustine explains it, "Ye both know Me, and know Me not." Ye know My form and features, and My manner of life, but Who I really am, the Eternal Son of God, ye know not. Ye know whence I am, that I am of the household of Joseph, and have lived in Nazareth, but my real Divine Origin ye know not, "for I am not come of myself." I came not as one coming into existence, but as one already in existence, and sent by Another.

"He that sent me is true." This has been variously explained. Some modern expositors take it as meaning, "He that sent me is real, the most real of beings," but surely this would make the Lord answer the thinly-veiled atheism of modern Agnostics, not the unbelief of the Jews. In a way, the very opposite to this, Cyril explains it as if the Lord referred to God as the God of truth, in opposition to Satan as the father of lies. "I am not come of myself, nor mine own messenger, like you, but I am come from heaven: true is He that sent Me, not like your lie-loving sender the Devil, whose spirit ye, receiving, are bold to prophecy falsely. True is he that sent Me, but he that stirreth you up to invent words from God, is not true." The best meaning seems to be, He is the true and faithful God, Who has fulfilled in Me truly and faithfully His own promises made to Abraham and David, that He would send the Messiah for the salvation of men.

"Whom ye know not," because ye are not of the truth, If ye were true—true to your consciences—true to your religion—true to your covenant, ye would be taught to know God, and to know Me as coming from God.

29. "But I know him: for I am from him, and he has sent me." Here is another declaration similar to many before and after, "I

30 Then [h] they sought to take him: but [i] no man laid hands on him, because his hour was not yet come.

31 And [k] many of the people believed on him, and said, When Christ cometh, will he do more miracles than these which this *man* hath done?

[h] Mark xi. 18. Luke xix. 47. & xx. 19. ver. 19. ch. viii. 37.
[i] ver. 44. ch. viii. 20.
[k] Matt. xii. 23. ch. iii. 2. & viii. 30.

---

am from God," I am from beside Him. He hath sent Me, not as a prophet is sent from among his people, not as an angel is sent from amongst his fellow-angels in heaven, but from His Bosom.

30. "Then they sought to take him, but no man laid hands . . . was not yet come." They sought, *i.e.*, the rulers, because they perceived that He had virtually re-asserted that peculiar relationship to God, at the first assertion of which they were so offended (chapter v. 17-23).

His hour was "not yet come." This must be understood in the light of verse 18 of chapter x., "I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me . . . I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment I have received of my Father." The Father had laid down the times and seasons of His Son's whole earthly Life; and so we have the Lord constantly speaking of His "hour" not *yet* being come, though it was close at hand.

31. "And many of the people believed on him, and said, When Christ cometh," &c. It is well worthy of notice that the same assertion of His intimate relationship to God which had provoked some to lay hands on Him, incited others of the people to believe on Him.

The carping, cavilling, unbelieving mind is repelled by the same thing which attracts the truly candid, sincere, and humble mind, viz., the assertion of the supernatural side of Christ's Person and Character.

It is a very great mistake which many, even in the Church, are guilty of, to sink the high claims of Christ as God, and to put forward only His example or influence as man. The infidel who is thus supposed to be met half-way, is not won to the Gospel, whilst a means is neglected by which the best souls may be attracted to God and Christ: for the Holy Spirit, as a rule, makes use of the highest claims of Christ, or doctrines which immediately result from His highest claims (such as His Atonement and Mediatorship) as the

32 ¶ The Pharisees heard that the people murmured such things concerning him; and the Pharisees and the chief priests sent officers to take him.

33 Then said Jesus unto them, [l] Yet a little while am I with you, and *then* I go unto him that sent me.

[l] ch. xiii. 33. & xvi. 16.

34 Ye [m] shall seek me, and shall not find *me:* and where I am, *thither* ye cannot come.

[m] Hos. v. 6. ch. viii. 21. & xiii. 33.

---

means whereby He acts most powerfully on the soul; and it is but natural that it should be so, for men instinctively feel that the redemption of such a world as ours requires a Redeemer very closely related to God, or He can be no redeemer in any true sense of the word.

"And said, When Christ cometh will he do more miracles," &c. The fact that many of the people could ask such a question as this, together with the report that their own officers brought respecting the power of His words, sealed the guilt of the rulers in not dispassionately examining the claims of Christ to be the Messiah. All the servants of God, the God of Abraham, who had come with special messages from Him, were accredited by miracles and signs. Their sacred books, in their most prominent prophecies, would lead them to expect a Messiah in some very high and unique sense the Son of God; but their pride and self-seeking, their seeking "honour one of another," blinded them to all this.

32. "The Pharisees heard that the people murmured such things," &c. The Pharisees who mixed among the people and were their religious leaders, on account of their great pretensions to sanctity, heard this wavering of the people in His favour, and they brought the report of this to the Chief Priests (though these Chief Priests were Sadducees), and by their authority procured that officers should be sent to take Him.

33. "Then said Jesus unto them, Yet a little while . . . him that sent me." A little while, a few months between that feast and the next Passover.

34. "Ye shall seek me, and shall not find me . . . thither ye cannot come." This mention of "seeking" seems to be suggested by the fact that they were then seeking Him for a malicious pur-

35 Then said the Jews among themselves, Whither will he go, that we shall not find him? will he go unto [n] the dispersed among the ‖ Gentiles, and teach the Gentiles?

[n] Is. xi. 12. James i. 1. 1 Pet. i. 1.
‖ Or, *Greeks.*

35. "The dispersed;" rather, "dispersion," original word in the singular number. "Gentiles." Literally, "Greeks."

pose. "It is but a little while, and then I shall go My way, and be safe from you in a place to which in your present state of body and soul ye cannot come: for I shall have ascended into heaven." There is great disagreement respecting the meaning of this passage, and, no doubt, there is great uncertainty respecting the "seeking" and "not finding," in connection with the words "where I am, thither ye cannot come." Some take them of the Jews vainly seeking the help of Christ as the Messiah, when the final judgment overtook their nation; and it may be that, if we had the account of that fearful time from a Christian's pen, we should read of many, some of them perhaps very old men, on whose ears these very words had fallen, vainly calling upon Him Whom they had once seen and rejected, to help them; but there was no answer, their day of grace was past, and they must endure the severity of judgment.

We can scarcely suppose that, by these words, our Lord shuts up all who were then seeking His Life, to ultimate unbelief and despair; for, if so, why the invitation, on the day of Pentecost, to those who "by wicked hands had crucified and slain" Him, to repent and be converted? We read of no seeking of the person of the Lord after the Crucifixion and Resurrection, but we do read that all who should call upon the Name of the Lord would be saved. Perhaps we may adopt Alford's suggestion, that we must not lay too much stress upon the word "seeking." It simply indicates that He would be removed out of the reach of all seeking of which they could then form any idea. But to suppose that it would be out of their power to repent and seek Him by prayer and faith, seems intolerable.

35. "Then said the Jews among themselves, Whither will he go?" &c. They seem to have altogether lost sight of the words, "I go My way to Him that sent Me," and only take notice of the prophecy of His departure to some place where they would not be able to find Him.

36 What *manner of* saying is this that he said, Ye shall seek me, and shall not find *me:* and where I am, *thither* ye cannot come?

37 °In the last day, that great *day* of the feast, ° Lev. xxiii. 36.

"Will he go unto the dispersed among the Gentiles, and teach the Gentiles?" This question they put probably in irony, but it is a remarkable one. It is considered by the Fathers, as Augustine, as a prophecy. "They knew not what they said, howbeit, because it was His will, they prophesied. For the Lord was about to go to the Gentiles, not in His bodily Presence, but with His feet [which Augustine explains to be the Church]. This, then, these men in no sort understood, and yet, taking occasion from this, they predicted our Salvation, that the Lord should go to the dispersion among the Gentiles."

Supposing, however, that they were not specially led to ask a question which implied a prophecy, we cannot help asking, "How came such a thought to suggest itself to them?" Had the Lord spoken much more about His mission to the Gentiles than what is recorded in the Gospel, or was it a sort of instinct which led them to surmise that One Who was so just, so charitable, and so loving to all human nature, would not ultimately confine His Salvation, and with it His teaching, to His own countrymen?

37, 38. "In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood . . . drink. He that believeth on me," &c. What gave occasion to these words, to which there is nothing corresponding in His discourses hitherto, either in chapter v. or in this chapter? They seem rather to follow out the words to the woman of Samaria, to whom the Lord says, "The water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life."

It is almost universally assumed by modern expositors, though the ancients (Chrysostom, Cyril, Augustine) knew nothing whatsoever about it, that this mention of Himself as the Giver of Living Water to those who believe, was suggested to Him by one of the customs of the feast (which we know from Rabbinical tradition only), that the priests carried water in a golden vessel with great solemnity, from the pool of Siloam, and poured it as a libation on the western side of the altar, whilst a libation of wine was poured on the eastern side.

Jesus stood and cried, saying, [p] If any man thirst, let him
[p] Is. lv. 1. ch. vi. 35. Rev. xxii. 17.
come unto me, and drink.
[q] Deut. xviii. 15.
[r] Prov. xviii. 4. Is. xii. 3. & xliv. 3. ch. iv. 14.
38 [q] He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, [r] out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.

During the time in which this was done, there were unusual rejoicings of the people and the greater Hallel was sung. But on the eighth day, though in other respects the most solemn day of the feast, this ceremony did not take place: so that, in allusion to its cessation the Lord proclaimed Himself as the Giver of an infinitely better water—the water of Life, which He would give to those who believed, and which should be a never-failing spring of spiritual refreshment, not to the man himself only, but to others, for out of his belly, *i.e.*, out of his inmost soul, should flow rivers or living water. Let the reader notice that there is here the same relation between believing and partaking of what Christ has to give to him that spiritually thirsts, as there was in the last chapter between believing and receiving Christ as the Bread of Life.

"If any man thirst, let him come to me and drink." "He that believeth on Me, as the Possessor and the Giver of the Living Water, if he truly believes, will come to Me for what I have to give. So that, as many promises of the Scriptures testify, out of such a man's heart shall flow rivers of living water."

"As the scripture hath said." There is no place where this is said in so many words, but it is asserted in a spiritual sense in all those prophecies in which it is predicted that ground, before dry and barren, would be made to abound with water; as, for instance, in Isaiah xxxv. 6, 7: "In the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert. And the parched ground shall become a pool, and the thirsty land springs of water." It would be a comparatively poor fulfilment of this that some dry tract in Judæa or the neighbouring deserts should become full of springs. Its true fulfilment is that the barren and thirsty soul pours out refreshing and fertilizing speech, and manifests the presence of the Spirit within it by a Christian example, the sight of which refreshes all around.

Some have joined the words, "As the scripture saith," with what goes before. "Let him that believeth on me, come to me, and

39 (s But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet *given*; because that Jesus was not yet t glorified.)

s Is. xliv. 3. Joel ii. 28. ch. xvi. 7. Acts ii. 17, 33, 38.
t ch. xii. 16. & xvi. 7.

---

39. "Given" is expressed in B., old Latin, Vulg., and Syriac.

drink, as the scripture saith." Others have joined "he that believeth on me" with "as the scripture saith," *i.e.*, according to the teaching of scripture respecting Me, making it to mean "he that believeth on me as I am revealed in scripture," but both seem inadmissible.

39. "But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive," &c. This verse teaches us, on the authority of the Apostle himself, that the Lord, in His discourses in this Gospel, said things which none at the time could understand. They must be received in implicit faith, and they must wait His time for explanation. In this case they would not have to wait long. It was as difficult for them to connect this with the Pentecostal gift as it was to interpret the promise of the living Bread, that is, His Flesh and Blood, of the Eucharist.

For consider what was the Pentecostal gift of the Spirit. It was the gift of the Spirit as proceeding from the Person, the human Nature of the risen and glorified Lord. It depended on His Atoning Death, His Resurrection, and His Ascension. It was the same Spirit as was given of old, but given through a new channel, the glorified Body of the God-Man; and for a new purpose, to unite men to Christ, and make them partakers of His Life and His Character.

This verse teaches us, also, that, however the Holy Ghost might have been given of old, He was given so abundantly through Christ, and for such high purposes, that it could be said that before Pentecost the Spirit was not yet [given]. If the word "given" be not in the original it must be understood, as there is no other way of completing the sense. The difference between the two dispensations seems to be that, under the old, He was given singly to individuals to act on their old nature only, whilst, under the new, He was given to the whole mystical body, the Church, through its Head, very abundantly. (Titus iii. 6, 1 Cor. xii. 7, 13.)

40 ¶ Many of the people therefore, when they heard this saying, said, Of a truth this is [u] the Prophet.

41 Others said, [x] This is the Christ. But some said, Shall Christ come [y] out of Galilee?

42 [z] Hath not the scripture said, That Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem, [a] where David was?

43 So [b] there was a division among the people because of him.

[u] Deut. xviii. 15, 18. ch. i. 21. & vi. 14.
[x] ch. iv. 42. & vi. 69.
[y] ver. 52. ch. i. 46.
[z] Ps. cxxxii. 11. Jer. xxiii. 5. Mic. v. 2. Matt. ii. 5. Luke ii. 4.
[a] 1 Sam. xvi. 1, 4.
[b] ver. 12. ch. ix. 16. & x. 19.

---

40. "Many." More probably "some" (ℵ, B., D., L., Vulg., old Latin, and some versions). "Many" read by later Uncials, Cureton and Peshito Syriacs, and most Cursives.

40. "Many of the people therefore . . . . Of a truth this is the Prophet. Others said, This is the Christ." Notice how here, as before, Christ subdues hearts prepared to receive Him by the unqualified assertion of His highest claims. He sets Himself forth as the one Bestower and Channel of the Spirit of God, and some exclaim, "He is the Prophet," the Prophet like unto Moses, others "This is the Christ." Did then the Jews of that day make a difference between the "Prophet" of Moses and the "Christ" of David, and the later prophets? We can hardly think so. The Coming One is set forth in prophecy under many names and figures. Some might choose to call Him by one name, and some by another; and yet, if they were questioned, all would be found to mean the same. There was assuredly but one Person looked for as the final Revealer of God.

41. "But some said, Shall Christ come out of Galilee?" It appears from this and other places, that the memory of the signs which had attended the Lord's Birth, the angels appearing to the shepherds, and the visit of the Magi, had long been lost, or that if there was a tradition of them they were in no respect connected with One Who, having lived so long in Nazareth, was supposed to have been born there. The miracles which Christ wrought and the power of His discourses should have taught them, if they had been at all in earnest about the coming of God's special Messenger, that it was their duty to ascertain all facts respecting One Who had such credentials.

43. "So there was a division." The word rendered division

44 And [c] some of them would have taken him; but no man laid hands on him.

[c] ver. 30.

45 ¶ Then came the officers to the chief priests and Pharisees; and they said unto them, Why have ye not brought him?

46 The officers answered, [d] Never man spake like this man.

[d] Matt. vii. 29.

47 Then answered them the Pharisees, Are ye also deceived?

48 [e] Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on him?

[e] ch. xii. 42. Acts vi. 7. 1 Cor. i. 20, 26. & ii. 8.

49 But this people who knoweth not the law are cursed.

---

46. "Spake like this man." MSS. of Neutral Text read, "so spake." Revisers have adopted the reading.

(schisma, schism) seems to imply more than a difference of opinion. The Vulgate translates it, "Therefore there arose a dissension in the multitude for him, and so some of them would have taken him," *i.e.* some of the multitude sided with the chief priests and Pharisees, and would have assisted them to apprehend Him.

45, 46. "Then came the officers . . . . never man spake like this man." Here then the chief priests had the most unprejudiced testimony, which they could possibly receive, as to the power and majesty of Christ's words. Such things as these made them inexcusable in not looking, on the one hand, to the prophetical intimations respecting the Messiah, to see whether they did not correspond to the witness which Christ gave of His relation to God; and, on the other hand, to His character and mighty works, whether they did not altogether accord with what He said of Himself as the Son of God.

47, 48. "Then answered them . . . . Have any of the rulers," &c. This shows the evil of believing secretly, and not having the courage to confess our convictions. If Nicodemus, and those whom he represented, when he said, "We know that thou art a teacher come from God," had only borne faithful witness, the enemies of Christ would not have been able to say as much as this.

49. "This people who knoweth not the law are cursed." Accord-

50 Nicodemus saith unto them, (f he that came † to Jesus by night, being one of them,)

51 g Doth our law judge *any* man, before it hear him, and know what he doeth?

52 They answered and said unto him, Art thou also of Galilee? Search, and look: for h out of Galilee ariseth no prophet.

53 And every man went unto his own house.

f ch. iii. 2.
† Gr. *to him.*
g Deut. i. 17. & xvii. 8, &c. & xix. 15.
h Is. ix. 1, 2. Matt. iv. 15. ch. i. 46. ver. 41.

---

50. "He that came to Jesus by night." Perhaps, rather, "He that came to Him before" (B., L.); but there is much uncertainty about the words within brackets. Vulgate reads, *ad eum nocte;* Syriac as in Text Receptus.

51. "Before it hear him." "Except it first hear from himself" (Revisers); *nisi prius audierit ab ipso* (Vulg.).

ing to their views this following of Christ was only to be explained by ignorance. They look down upon the people with proud contempt. Nowhere was the pride of scholars greater than in Israel. They called the people of the land *sheketz*, an abomination, and one of their proverbs was, "the ignorant is impious, only the learned shall have part in the Resurrection."

50, 51. "Nicodemus saith unto them . . . . Doth our law judge any man," &c. These words "Have any of the rulers," &c., seem to have touched the conscience of Nicodemus, who (apparently) without confessing that he believed in Jesus, yet demands that He should be treated with something like justice. "Doth our law judge any man," &c.?

52. "They answered and said unto him, Art thou also of Galilee?" Even this slight concession to fairness and equity they would not tolerate. "Art thou also of Galilee?" they rejoined.

"Out of Galilee ariseth no prophet." This appeal to history has been assumed to be false, and has been used to disparage the correctness of St. John's narrative. Four prophets are supposed to have come out of Galilee—Elijah, Nahum, Hosea, and Jonah; but, as Godet shows, of these Elijah was of Gilead, Hosea of Samaria, Nahum of Elkosh, a place unknown, and the place of Jonah's birth, Gath Hephir, probably was not within the bounds of the original Galilee.

CHAP. VIII.

JESUS went unto the mount of Olives.

2 And early in the morning he came again into the temple, and all the people came unto him; and he sat down, and taught them.

---

vii. 53—viii. 1-11. The only Manuscript of the first importance which contains this paragraph of the woman taken in adultery is D. (but Tregelles remarks that its text here is very dissimilar to others). The later Uncials, F., G., H., K., U., Γ, contain it. E., M., Δ contain it, but marked as doubtful by asterisks. It is omitted by ℵ, B., T. (the latter is supposed by Tischendorf to be of the fifth century, and contains this part of St. John, omitting this section). A. is wanting from John vi. 50 to viii. 52, but by measuring the space it is certain that it could not possibly have had this section. So also C., L., Δ have a vacant space here, so that the writers omit, but are conscious of the omission. It is thus rejected by ℵ, A., B., C., L. It is omitted by an extraordinary number of Cursives (among these the most important ones), and relegated by a large number to the end of the Gospel. It is omitted by the old Latin (a, f). It is wanting in the best MSS. of the Peshito (though inserted in some printed editions, such as Leusden and Schaaf's, who in a note enumerate the editions in which it is wanting); the Cureton Syriac is here deficient. It is wanting also in most ancient versions. Chrysostom and Cyril take no notice of it whatsoever in their commentaries. Tregelles writes: "Respecting this section *all* the more ancient writers are silent." With this array of evidence against it, it is impossible to regard it as a genuine part of St. John's Gospel, though it bears every mark of being an account by an eye-witness inserted in later copies, but still very ancient ones. The authorities for it are Latin only.

All the evidence by which we judge respecting the genuineness of any passage of the New Testament, is against the retention of ch. vii. 53—viii. 12, as an original part of St. John's Gospel. Whether, however, it be not a true account of a remarkable incident in our Lord's ministry is another matter altogether. It bears every mark of being a primitive tradition, but not inserted in the Gospel as first published. I think we are bound to treat it as a record of what actually took place. And as in most copies of the New Testament it is inserted here, this seems the proper place for us to comment on its teaching.

1. "Jesus went up unto the mount of Olives." The fact of the Mount of Olives being mentioned nowhere else in this Gospel is taken, by most editors, as a sign of doubtfulness.

2. "He sat down and taught them." This was the posture of

3 And the scribes and Pharisees brought unto him a woman taken in adultery; and when they had set her in the midst,

4 They say unto him, Master, this woman was taken in adultery, in the very act.

---

viii. 1-12. The text of this section varies so much that I shall almost entirely confine myself to the received text. The reader will find two Greek Texts in Alford and Tregelles, and the Latin (c and e and Amiatinus) in Scrivener's "Introduction," p. 317, second edition.

3. D. reads "in sin."

4. Some Latin authorities omit "in the very act."

authoritative teaching. It was that which He assumed when He preached the Sermon on the Mount.

3-5. "And the scribes and Pharisees . . . . what sayest thou?" It is noticed that this is the only place in this Gospel in which Scribes and Pharisees are mentioned together, and this also is commonly cited as against the genuineness of this paragraph.

This was done to tempt the Lord. It is difficult, however, to say with certainty what was the point of the temptation. It is usually explained thus: If the Lord had said that the penalty of the law of Moses must not be exacted, they would have accused Him to the multitude of making light of sin. If He said that they must proceed according to the severe letter of the law, they would have accused Him to the governor of adjudging a criminal to death when the Jews had no power to inflict capital punishment; but this explanation is unsatisfactory, for, supposing that He had said that the law of Moses must be obeyed, it would not have devolved upon Him to see to its execution. Pilate, if the case had come before him, would have said, "What right had you to bring such a matter before a private person? You who stoned her on the opinion of a private person are wholly responsible." The point of the temptation seems altogether in the first alternative. They well remembered such words as "the publicans and the harlots enter into the kingdom of heaven before you;" "I am not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them;" "God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world." Remembering these or similar words, they surmised that He would, probably, take a merciful view of the case; and, if so, they would malign Him as being indifferent to purity and chastity.

5 [a] Now Moses in the law commanded us, that such should be stoned: but what sayest thou?

[a] Lev. xx. 10. Deut. xxii. 22.

6 This they said, tempting him, that they might have to accuse him. But Jesus stooped down, and with *his* finger wrote on the ground, *as though he heard them not.*

6. "This they said, tempting him, that they might have to accuse him," omitted by D., but is contained in old Latin MSS. (c and e) and in Vulgate.

"*As though he heard them not*" are in E., G., H., K.; not in D., old Latin, or Vulg. or Syriac.

They did not understand the difference of His attitude towards sin and the sinner. He never gave the smallest allowance to sin. It was He Who said with such fearful emphasis, "If thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut it off and cast it from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire:" but He always regarded the sinner with the utmost compassion, even the gross sinner, because He saw in him the image of God, which, though degraded, might be restored, and He had come to restore it.

5. "Now Moses in the law . . . what sayest thou?" The words in Levit. xx. 10 and Deut. xxii. 22, are that the adulterer and the adulteress should *both* be put to death, stoning not being mentioned. Very probably, as stoning was the usual mode of executing criminals, they mentioned it as the form of death with which they were most familiar.

6. "But Jesus stooped down, and with his finger wrote on the ground, *as though he heard them not.*" What was the significance of this act? [We are to remember that the words, "as though he heard them not," are a late gloss.] It has been taken to signify indifference. "The habit was an usual one, to signify pre-occupation of mind, or intentional indifference." Others take it to indicate shame—He stooped, wishing to hide his face. A great number of conjectures have been hazarded, May I be permitted to suggest one more? The matter was concerning the crime of adultery. Now there was a special provision made in Numbers v. 11-30 to meet the case of jealousy on the part of a husband of his wife whom he suspected of having committed this crime. She was to be brought into the temple. The priest was to take holy water in an earthen vessel, and "of the dust that is in the floor of the tabernacle," and put it into the water, and make her drink of the water, charging

7 So when they continued asking him, he lifted up him-
[a] Deut. xvii. 7. Rom. ii. 1. self, and said unto them, [b] He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her.

---

her with an oath of cursing that, if she had committed the crime, her belly should swell, and her thigh should rot; but if she was innocent she was to pass the trial unscathed. This was, as it were, a trial by ordeal, God Himself undertaking to interpose, acquitting the innocent, and punishing the guilty, as the ever-present Ruler and Judge in the Theocracy. The Lord's action was intended to remind them of this long obsolete statute. He wrote, of course, in the dust of the floor,—that very dust which, if the law of Moses had been in its original force, would have of itself punished the adulteress. This would remind them of the fact that the Theocracy, as revealed by Moses, existed no longer, and as it had passed away, they could not now urge the letter of the law in all its severity against the offender before them, as they might have done if they had lived in the ages when God Himself interposed to vindicate His law.

It should also be noticed that they were not dealing justly, for by the law the man who had committed adultery with the woman was to be put to death with her. How was it that they brought the woman only, and not her paramour? A woman despised and held to be almost out of the pale of the law, might be dragged forward and publicly exposed, when it would have been very unsafe to deal so with the man, who was equally guilty.

Whether such an explanation of this very peculiar act of our Lord is feasible may be matter of opinion, but it is clear that they had no right to urge the extreme penalty of a law which, in the matter of this very crime of adultery, they did not attempt to obey in its integrity.

7. "So when they continued asking him, . . . first cast a stone at her." What are we to understand by the words "without sin"? We cannot suppose that the Lord means sinless or perfect, for not only no capital punishment, but no punishment at all could be inflicted, if only the sinless were the ministers of the law. The words can be explained by a well-known fact, the then frightful prevalence of the crime of adultery. "So rife had the crime become, that about this time, by advice of R. Jochanan ben Zacchai, from

8 And again he stooped down, and wrote on the ground.

9 And they which heard *it*, [c] being convicted by *their own* conscience, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, *even* unto the last: and Jesus was left alone, and the woman standing in the midst.

[c] Rom. ii. 22.

---

9. "Being convicted by their own conscience" contained in E., G., H., K., S.; omitted by D., M., U., and old Latin, Vulg., and Syriac.
"Unto the last" omitted by D., E., G., H., K., M., Vulg., and Syriac.

Hosea iv. 14, the Sanhedrim abrogated the trial, as it failed unless the husband was himself blameless. See Lightfoot's Horæ Hebr. and sermon."

No sins harden more than breaches of the seventh commandment, so that it is by no means improbable that wretches who would drag this woman forward in the temple in order to obtain ground of accusation against such an one as our Lord, had all been guilty of the very crime of which they accused her.

9. "And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conscience," &c. Considering their malignity, and their making use of such an accusation in such a place against our Lord, their consciences must have been hard and callous: and so this was not an ordinary bringing of sins to remembrance, but a special act of the Supreme Judge, bringing their past history before them in a moment, as He will do with all at the last day, and as He does with some even in this life.

That it was no ordinary act of conviction of sin is clear from the express notice of the order in which they went out, one by one, beginning at the eldest [even unto the last]—beginning, that is, with the most seared and callous, and ending with the younger—with those whose consciences would, from their shorter experience of sin, have probably been the tenderest. This stamps this action of our Lord as being out of the ordinary course of His working on men's consciences.

"And Jesus was left alone, and the woman standing in the midst." This is not to be taken as if there were no bystanders; the Lord singled out the accusers only, and compelled them to testify against themselves that they were not innocent of the crime of which they had accused the woman.

10 When Jesus had lifted up himself, and saw none but the woman, he said unto her, Woman, where are those thine accusers? hath no man condemned thee?

11 She said, No man, Lord. And Jesus said unto her, [d] Neither do I condemn thee: go, and [e] sin no more.

d Luke ix. 56. & xii. 14. ch. iii. 17.
e ch. v. 14.

12 ¶ Then spake Jesus again unto them, saying, [f] I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.

f ch. i. 4, 5, 9. & iii. 19. & ix. 5. & xii. 35, 36, 46.

---

10. "And saw none but the woman" omitted by D., Vulg., Syriac.
"Where are those thine accusers?" omitted by D., Vulg. (C. Amiatinus), and Syriac.
12. "Darkness." Literally, "the darkness."

10. "When Jesus had lifted up himself . . . hath no man condemned thee?"—*i.e.*, to punishment: the words should certainly be so translated, because here it cannot mean to account guilty of a wicked act, but must mean to follow up that judgment by delivering over to punishment. The Lord could not but condemn the sin, if it had been committed, but He declined to pass any such sentence upon the sinner as was contained in the law to which the Jews had made appeal.

The Lord did nothing more than this. He did not pronounce her forgiveness, as He had done in the case of the man sick of the palsy (Matt. ix. 2), or of the woman that was a sinner (Luke vii. 47). "Were He a favourer of sins, He would say, Neither will I condemn thee: go, live as thou wilt; be sure of My deliverance, how much soever thou mayest sin. . . . Not this said He. He is a gentle Lord, a long-suffering Lord, a pitiful Lord, yea, but also a just Lord, and a true Lord. He giveth thee space to correct thy ways: but thou lovest the respite of thy punishment more than the amendment of thy faults." (Augustine.)

12. "Then spake Jesus . . . I am the light of the world." None could say this but One Who "was with God and was God:" for throughout the Old Testament Jehovah is set forth as the Light. "The Lord is my light and my salvation." (Ps. xxvii. 1.) "The light of Israel shall be for a fire." (Isaiah x. 17.) "The Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light." (Isaiah lx. 19.) In every sense is Jesus the

13 The Pharisees therefore said unto him, [s] Thou bearest record of thyself; thy record is not true.

[s] ch. v. 31.

13. "Record;" "witness;" *testimonium* (Vulg.).

Light of the World. He is the "light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world." He is the Light in which we see the Father, in which we see the will of God, the law of God, the purposes of God; "in thy light shall we see light."

But He is only the light to those who receive Him as the Light, and follow Him as the Light. "He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the Light of Life." Here we have that again which we have so constantly noticed in this Gospel, that under every form of grace under which Jesus reveals Himself, He must be met by a corresponding faith, and an obedience corresponding to that faith. Does He set Himself forth as the Bread of Life, as the Bread of Life He must be received and eaten; for bread is given us to be eaten. And so light is for guidance, that we should not err from the way, or grope in uncertainty, much less do the deeds of darkness. So, then, if we truly and sincerely believe that Christ is the Light, as the Light we shall follow Him, by submitting ourselves to be guided by Him.

"Shall not walk in darkness." This darkness is not intellectual darkness in matters of Christian doctrine. On the contrary, St. John in his Epistle (1 John ii. 9) particularly specifies it as want of Charity, as living in malice and hatred: "He that saith, he is in the light and hateth his brother, is in darkness even until now. He that loveth his brother abideth in the light, and there is none occasion of stumbling in him, but he that hateth his brother is in darkness, and walketh in darkness," &c.

"The light of life." Light of any sort can only be apprehended by life. The sun shines on the rock, and it feels it not, but when the sun shines upon a thing which has life, the living creature takes in the light through its organ of vision, and is guided by it to fulfil its place among living creatures; and so where Christ shines into the heart, His Light brings with it not only illumination, but Life; as we have said under chapter i. 4, that which corresponds to life in lower forms of creatures, becomes in renewed man moral and spiritual light.

13. "The Pharisees therefore said unto him, Thou bearest record." Here Christ's opponents remember how He had disclaimed

14 Jesus answered and said unto them, Though I bear record of myself, *yet* my record is true: for I know whence I came, and whither I go; but [h]ye cannot tell whence I come, and whither I go.

[h] See ch. vii. 28. & ix. 29.

15 [i]Ye judge after the flesh; [k]I judge no man.

[i] ch. vii. 24.
[k] ch. iii. 17. & xii. 47. & xviii. 36.

16 And yet if I judge, my judgment is true:

His own witness to Himself (chap. v. 31), and they rejoin by turning, as they think, His words against Himself. This is a proof of the unity of this discourse with that in chap. v.

14. "Jesus answered, Though I bear record . . . . whence I came, and whither I go." Here the Lord seems to fall back on what He had said in ch. v. 30, 31, where He had spoken both of witnessing and judging, that neither His judgment nor His witness were alone. If He judged, He judged according to what He saw in the Father; if He witnessed, the Father witnessed to Him. He was conscious of this, for "I know whence I came," even from the Fountain of Eternal Truth, and "whither I go," even back again to the same Fountain. "But ye cannot tell whence I come, and whither I go," because—

15. "Ye judge after the flesh." "Ye judge only by the marks of My humiliation. Ye judge according to the lowest standard, by which I seem as but one of yourselves. Ye leave out of account My mighty works, the power of My words, the testimony of John to Me, the testimony of your own prophets to the coming of such a Messiah as I claim to be;" or it may also mean, "'Ye judge after the flesh;' your own innate evil is the true cause of your false view of Me; ye suffer your passions, and your dislike of the truth, because that truth condemns you, to warp your judgment."

"I judge no man." This may mean, "I judge no man as yet. I am not come into the world to judge it, but to save it;" or it may look to the low and unjust judgment which they formed of Him by judging Him only after the flesh. "Ye judge Me after the flesh." Me, Whose judgment is not after the flesh, but according to that Eternal Truth which I see in the Father, "I judge no man" now, but even though you oppose Me, and persecute Me, I deal in mercy with you by keeping your door of grace open to you.

16. "And yet if I judge, my judgment is true . . . . I and the Father that sent me." My judgment is true, *i.e.*, not only according

for [l]I am not alone, but I and the Father that sent me.

[l] ver. 29. ch. xvi. 32.

17 [m]It is also written in your law, that the testimony of two men is true.

[m] Deut. xvii 6. & xix. 15. Matt. xviii. 16. 2 Cor. xiii. 1. Heb. x. 28.

18 I am one that bear witness of myself, and [n]the Father that sent me beareth witness of me.

[n] ch. v. 37.

19 Then said they unto him, Where is thy Father? Jesus answered, [o]Ye neither know me, nor my Father: [p]if ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also.

[o] ver. 55. ch. xvi. 3.
[p] ch. xiv. 7.

---

to the facts of any one case, but because I am One with the Eternal Truth. In all that I judge, just as in all that I work (ch. v. 19), in all that I witness (ch. v. 36), and in all that I teach (ch. vii. 16), the Father is with Me. Being One in essence (ch. x. 30), We are One in work, in witness, in teaching, in judgment.

17. "It is also written in your law"—more particularly in Deut. xix. 15—"the testimony of two witnesses is true." True here, of course, means valid—to be relied on in all ordinary cases of judicial evidence.

18. "I am one that beareth witness of myself . . . beareth witness of me." This is the strongest assertion conceivable against anything approaching to that view of the Godhead—which is called Sabellianism—that the Trinity is not Three Persons, but three manifestations of One Person. Our Lord, after asserting the Oneness of His Father with Himself in such words as "I do nothing of myself," "I am not alone," here speaks of the relation of the Father to Himself in the matter of bearing witness, as that of two men to one another, *i.e.*, two personalities. This place fully vindicates the Church in having adopted into the current language of her Theology such a word as "Person." No matter what its derivation or first use, it has been employed for ages as a word signifying an individual, separated from all others by having his own will, no matter how entirely that will may be in accord with that of another person, to whom he may be subordinate.

19. "Then said they unto him, Where is thy Father? . . . Father also." In all probability this means, "Thou hast been speaking of another Witness to Thyself—even Thy Father, but

20 These words spake Jesus in [q] the treasury, as he taught in the temple: and [r] no man laid hands on him; for [s] his hour was not yet come.

21 Then said Jesus again unto them, I go my way, and [t] ye shall seek me, and [u] shall die in your sins: whither I go, ye cannot come.

[q] Mark xii. 41.
[r] ch. vii. 30.
[s] ch. vii. 8.
[t] ch. vii. 34. & xiii. 33.
[u] ver. 24.

---

where is He? let Him come forward, that we may hear his testimony to Thee." And with this agrees the Lord's answer, "It is useless bringing you a Witness Whom ye know not; for ye neither know Me nor my Father." "If ye had known Me," if ye had known, which ye well could, that My words, and My works, and My character witness to the power and wisdom of God within Me, then ye would have known my Father, for "he that hath seen Me hath seen the Father," and ye would have perceived in all My Life and works My witness to Him, and His to Me.

20. "These words spake Jesus in the treasury . . . for his hour was not yet come." The significance of this is that Jesus boldly taught these things which utterly condemned His adversaries in a place which was under the absolute control of such adversaries, and yet He was Divinely protected. He was, apparently, as regards His Person, more than ever in their power, and yet "no man laid hands on him, because his hour had not yet come."

21. "Then said Jesus." If the "then" means "therefore," this signifies: Therefore, because of His immunity from capture and death till His hour was come, Jesus said to them again, &c. The Lord here follows up what He had been saying before, so that the discourse is continuous, even though some time may have elapsed between the utterance of verse 19 and this.

"I go my way, and ye shall seek me, and shall," &c. I go my way—*i.e.*, to the Father, not into the unseen world merely, or into Paradise, but into the bosom of the Father.

"Ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins." Taken in connection with vii. 34, "Ye shall seek me, and shall not find me," it means that they should seek in vain, seek and not find; but why? Certainly not because they sought Him for deliverance from sin, but because they sought Him merely under temporal distress. As clouds of national troubles gathered around, they would go on desiring the Coming of the Messiah, but would not believe that He

22 Then said the Jews, Will he kill himself? because he saith, Whither I go, ye cannot come.

---

had come in the Person of Jesus, and so would perish in unbelief, and in their sins; and they who die in their sins cannot come where Christ is—they cannot come to God.

It will be necessary somewhat carefully to examine the intention of the words, "Ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins." The two things seem the most opposite possible. To seek Christ as a Saviour from sin implies that the soul so seeking is coming out of sin, and seeking help from Christ to deliver it from the evil thing: so that this cannot mean spiritual seeking.

Were these words, then, said prophetically? Did Christ know that the Jews before Him had committed the sin against the Holy Ghost, and so had passed the limits of God's forbearance in their opposition to Him, and were now shut up to unbelief and despair? Augustine, in one part of his exposition, writes as though he thought this: "Whereas men whose hope is in God ought not to render evil, no, not even evil for evil, these rendered evil for good. Therefore the Lord fore-announced to them, and spake their sentence in His fore-knowledge that they should die in their sins." But further on Augustine recalls the severity of this: "He called them back to hope, for He added, 'If ye believe not that I am, ye shall die in your sins.' Consequently, if ye believe that I am, ye shall not die in your sins. Hope is restored to the despairing, a rousing is given to the sleeping, in their hearts they have waked up; of them very many believed, as the sequel of the Gospel itself showeth." There can be no doubt that this last quotation gives the true answer, for the Lord, Who, in verse 21, says absolutely that they shall die in their sins, in verse 24 puts the matter hypothetically: "I said unto you that ye shall die in your sins, for if ye believe not that I am *He*, ye shall die in your sins." So that we humbly hope that many who were then opposing Him, might come finally under the gracious intimation of verse 28, "When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he."

22. "Then said the Jews, Will he kill himself?" &c. There seems to have been an extraordinary depth of malignity in this question. Those who committed self-murder were held by the Jews to go down to a deeper place in Hades, into which all true Jews were

23 And he said unto them, [x] Ye are from beneath; I am from above: [y] ye are of this world; I am not of this world.

24 [z] I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins: [a] for if ye believe not that I am *he*, ye shall die in your sins.

[x] ch. iii. 31.
[y] ch. xv. 19. & xvii. 16. 1 John iv. 5.
[z] ver. 21.
[a] Mark xvi. 16.

---

supposed to be free from any danger of entering. So that they maliciously and blasphemously reverse the sense of the words of the Lord. He said that He should go to a place which their sins would prevent them from entering, and they, in wicked scorn, made His words mean that He, by His own act, would go down after death to a lower depth than any to which they could possibly descend.

23. "And he said unto them, Ye are from beneath; I am from above," &c. The words which they had just spoken showed their true origin. The insinuation was diabolical, and so the Lord rejoins, "Ye are from beneath ['of your father the devil,' v. 44], I am from above, from the Author of Good. Ye consequently are of the world, of which your father is the prince. I am not of this world, I am from God, and so I speak the words and do the works of God."

24. "I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins: *for* if ye believe not," &c. The connection seems to be of this sort: "Ye are from beneath, ye are of this world, and so, till a mightier power acts upon you to lift you up, to raise you above the world, to make you from above as I am (which power is promised in verse 28), ye cannot believe that I AM, and so ye will, if ye die in your present state, die in your sins."

"If ye believe not that I am he." The Jews evidently did not understand these words as asserting self-existence ("I am that I am," "I am hath sent Me," or they would have taken up stones to stone Him; but knowing from other utterances of His own and of His servants Who He is, *we* can only understand Him as asserting His own participation in the One uncreated Essence. It is with this as with many other of His sayings, men understood them not at the first, but when He was risen and had ascended, and had sent the Spirit, then they saw what He meant.

25 Then said they unto him, Who art thou? And Jesus saith unto them, Even *the same* that I said unto you from the beginning.

---

25. "Even the same that I said unto you from the beginning." The order of the words is, "From the beginning (an accusative used adverbially) what also I spake unto you." I have been obliged to put the critical examination below.

25. "Then said they unto him . . . the same that I said unto you from the beginning." It would only confuse the reader to give the numerous interpretations which have been assigned to this apparently plain answer of our Lord. Three may be noticed as heads or types under which all the rest, more or less, range themselves.

(1.) That He dismissed their question with contempt. "Why do I speak unto you at all?" This has been taken to be Chrysostom's interpretation, but it is doubtful whether it is so. Many modern interpreters (Westcott, Milligan, &c.) adopt it. Alford dismisses it as "not only ungrammatical, but most alien from the whole character of our Lord's discourses." The latter it most certainly is.

(2.) The second is, that the Lord intended to answer their question, and virtually to reassert that He was the "I am." This is the meaning of the Latin. "(I am) the Beginning, Who also speak to you." Augustine writes: "It was as if they had said, since we have been told by Thee 'Except ye believe that I am,' what shall we believe Thee to be? to this then He made answer, 'The *Beginning*,' as much as to say, 'Believe me to be the Beginning.'"

(3.) The third is, that He does not answer their question directly, but refers them back to what He had always told them.[1] This is the meaning of our Authorized, "Even the same that I said unto you from the beginning." The Revisers of 1881 seem to agree. "Even that which I have also spoken to you from the beginning." So virtually Alford, translating, however, the words for "from the

---

[1] This probably may be Chrysostom's interpretation: "What He saith is of this kind, 'Ye are not worthy to hear My words at all, much less to learn who I am; for ye say all that ye do tempting Me, and giving heed to none of My sayings. And all this I could now prove against you.'" This, the reader will perceive, is quite compatible with the words meaning, "I have all along told you sufficiently Who I am."

26 I have many things to say and to judge of you: but
[b] ch. viii. 28. [b] he that sent me is true; and [c] I speak to the
[c] ch. iii. 32. & xv. 15. world those things which I have heard of him.
27 They understood not that he spake to them of the Father.
28 Then said Jesus unto them, When ye have [d] lifted up
[d] ch. iii. 14. & xii. 22. the Son of man, [e] then shall ye know that I am
[e] Rom. i. 4.

---

beginning," by "in very deed." "In very deed the same which I also speak unto you." "Exactly what I also declare unto you." (Godet.) This third class of interpretations seems to afford the best sense, and to be far more in accordance with the tenor of our Lord's previous discourses. He was not likely to dismiss them with the scorn and contempt which is implied in the first interpretation. He was not likely in their then state of mind to tell them directly that He was the beginning of all things, in fact the Alpha and Omega; but it was very likely that He would tell them that from the very beginning of His speaking to them He had sufficiently indicated to them, if they would have received it, that He was from above—from Heaven—from the Father.

26. "I have many things to say and to judge of you: but .... heard of him." We must understand these words somewhat in this way. "I have many things to speak, and not only to speak, but to judge concerning you when the time of judging comes; but however painful it is to speak them, and however difficult it is for you to receive what I say, I have no alternative, for I speak not of Myself. He that sent Me is true, and His words and His sentence is true, and as I judge what I have seen in Him, so I speak to the world those things which I have heard of Him."

27. "They understood not that He spake unto them of the Father." Plain as His assertion seemed, they were not likely to understand it, inasmuch as through their own sin they really knew neither Himself nor His Father (v. 19).

28. "When ye shall have lifted up the Son of man," &c. This "lifting up" is both the "lifting up" on the Cross, and the "lifting up" to heaven at the Ascension. The one is in the Eternal Mind and Will inseparably connected with the other. "He became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, wherefore God also hath highly exalted him." (Phil. ii.)

"After that the Holy Ghost was sent from on high, when miracles

he, and [f]*that* I do nothing of myself; but [g]as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things.

29 And [h]he that sent me is with me: [i]the

[f] ch. v. 19, 30.
[g] ch. iii. 11.
[h] ch. xiv. 10, 11.
[i] ver. 16.

29. "The Father" omitted in B., D., L., most old Latin, Vulg., Sah., Coptic; but later Uncials, and almost all Cursives, Syriac, Goth., retain.

were wrought in the name of Him Whom as dead the persecuting Jews had despised, they were pricked in heart; and the same who in their rage had killed Him, being changed, believed in Him; and the Blood which in their raging they had shed, by believing they drank." (Augustine.)

"Then shall ye know that I am [He]." From the time of the Ascension the Church knew Christ to be God, and entered into the meaning of such sayings of His as "I am," "I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End, the First and the Last." With this the Church realized also His perfect unanimity with the Father. "Ye shall know," says Chrysostom, "both My power and My unanimity with the Father. Because the 'of myself I speak nothing,' showeth that His Substance differeth nothing (from that of the Father), and that He uttereth nothing save that which is in the mind of the Father."

"As my Father hath taught me, I speak these things." So afterwards our Lord says: "He gave me a commandment what I should do and what I should teach."

This whole verse must be thoroughly accepted and realized if we would understand this Gospel of St. John aright. We have here the Lord expressly declaring that the time for the understanding of His deepest sayings was yet future. The discourses in this Gospel are pre-eminently His discourses as the "I Am," "the Word Who was with God, and was God." Here he asserts the inability of the mass of those who heard Him (if not of all) to understand them *then*. But He plainly intimates that the time would come when they would believe and accept them, they would know that He IS, that He can say of Himself "I am," and that no created being can say "I am" in the same sense, and also they would know His perfect oneness with the Father in every act (I do nothing of Myself), and in every word (I speak nothing of Myself.)

29. "And he that sent me is with me: [the Father] hath not left me alone," &c. "He sent me, so that in a sense I left Him,

Father hath not left me alone; [k]for I do always those things that please him.

[k] ch. iv. 34. & v. 30. & vi. 38.

30 As he spake these words, [l]many believed on him.

[l] ch. vii. 31. & x. 42. & xi 45.

31 Then said Jesus to those Jews which be-

---

and yet in another sense I am ever with Him, for I am in the Father and the Father in Me (xiv. 10, 20).

"He hath not left me alone." "I am in never-ceasing communion with Him. If My disciples all forsake Me, yet I am not alone, because the Father is with Me: even if, when I pass through the Valley of the Shadow of Death, for a little moment I feel abandoned, yet even then He upholds Me."

"For I do always those things which please Him." Is this said from the human or the Divine standpoint? It is really said from the Divine, as the Eternal Son: for the human relationship of son and father is but a shadow of the Divine. If the human earthly son and father are not perfectly in accord, it is because of the imperfection of their nature; but because of the perfection of the nature of the Divine Son, His Will is perfectly in union with the Supreme Goodness, and Wisdom, and Love, which is in the Father; so that the perfection of the Son's Life of obedience is a proof that the Father, the Fountain of all good, is always "with Him."

30. "As He spake these words, many believed on him." Here, again, we have to notice that the assertion of the highest claims of Christ on His part bowed the hearts of some to believe on Him. Here He asserts that the unity of will between God and Himself is perfect, and this truth, which no other human being could utter or apprehend in anything like fulness, commands belief at once. How mistaken, then, are those Christians who, in an unbelieving age, keep back the Godhead of Christ and the things which directly spring out of it, lest they should give offence to infidels!

31. "Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him, If ye continue," &c. Are the persons who "believed on Him" of verse 30 the same as those to whom He spake in this verse 31? "Then said Jesus to those Jews who believed [on] Him." Notwithstanding the difference between "believing on Him" and believing Him, it would seem that they are the same, for He recognizes their faith as real, in the next clause, where he says, "If ye con-

lieved on him, If ye continue in my word, *then* are ye my disciples indeed;

---

31. "Believed on Him;" rather, "believed Him" or "had believed Him."

tinue in my Word"—this must imply that they were in some sense "*in* His Word," but by no means so safely that they could not fall from it. They were not yet proved to be truly disciples as the twelve were, who had hitherto continued in it, and would do so to the end. But is it possible that these persons could be addressed in such words as those of verse 37? "Ye seek to kill me, because my word hath no place in you," still more in the words of verse 40, "Ye are of your Father the Devil." It seems not, and yet the persons who answer in the words, "We be Abraham's seed," of verse 33, are those who continue to wrangle with Him to the end. Two or three ways have been adopted of getting over the difficulty. 1st. That those who believed in Him, of verse 30, were "believers in the fullest sense of the word, casting themselves upon Him, and accepting Him with the heart." These, however, for some unaccountable reason, stand aside, or disappear; Jesus takes no further notice of them or they of His words, and He ignores their presence, and begins to address Himself solely to the Jews who believed Him, *i.e.*, the truth of His highest words, and yet are supposed to retain their old carnal prepossession respecting an earthly Messiah, a Messiah who would restore the kingdom to Israel (which to a great extent the ten Apostles believed). But let the reader consider for a moment what were the words which He had just uttered, which they are said to have believed. "He that sent me is with me; the Father hath not left me alone." Surely men who could believe a word like this must have had some belief *in* Him Who could say such a thing. All this shows that too much stress is laid on the difference between believing *on* Him and believing Him, particularly when we find that believing Him that sent Him (ch. v. 24, Revised), expressed the fullest belief unto life.

Another explanation is, by supposing that "they," the persons who answered Him in the words "We are Abraham's seed," were some unbelieving Jews among the crowd who took offence at His words about the truth making free; and it is in favour of this view that from this point the Lord never once recognizes their belief. He even says to them, "ye cannot hear my word" (v. 43). This surely is incompatible with any belief in Him.

32 And ye shall know the truth, and [m] the truth shall make you free.

[m] Rom. vi. 14, 18, 22. & viii. 2. James i. 25. & ii. 12.

The third is, that their belief, though real for a very short time, was dissipated, and turned into deadly opposition when He set before them that He was come to free them—*i.e.* to free them from sin to which they were enslaved because they loved and cherished it. We would fain hope that this cannot be, but it is scarcely more terrible and strange than the fall of St. Peter, the treachery of Judas, who must once have believed, and the first rejection by the eleven of the evidence of the Resurrection. In this case we are taught the exceeding weakness and fickleness of all human faith before Pentecost.

The second of these views appears most in accordance with facts. Perhaps there was a pause after verse 36, when some of the more determined enemies of Christ came forward.

"If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed." Continuing in Christ's word means not merely carefully retaining it, but earnestly dwelling upon it, applying it to ourselves, and submitting to be guided by it. Nothing can be more remarkably in contrast with so much of the popular religionism of our day (which makes final salvation accomplished in a moment) than the continued and earnest calls of Christ and His Apostles to believers to abide in the word, to hold it fast, to allow it to dwell in us richly. There seems to be very great danger lest Satan snatch it away, lest the shallowness of our hearts cause it to whither, lest the world choke it.

"Then are ye my disciples indeed." Remember the words of the Lord uttered some time after this, "He that abideth in me and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit." "Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit, so shall ye be my disciples." (John xv. 5-8.)

32. "And ye shall know the truth." What! Knew they it not when the Lord spake? If they knew it not, how did they believe? They did not believe because they knew, but in order that they might know, therefore they believed. For we believe in order to know, not know in order to believe. (Augustine.) And, again, "If there be a continuing in that which is believed, there shall be a coming to that which is seen."

33 ¶ They answered him, [n] We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man: how sayest thou, Ye shall be made free?

[n] Lev. xxv. 42. Matt. iii. 9. ver. 39.

34 Jesus answered them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, [o] Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin.

[o] Rom. vi. 16, 20. 2 Pet. ii. 19.

35 And [p] the servant abideth not in the house for ever: *but* the Son abideth ever.

[p] Gal. iv. 30.

"And the truth shall make you free." This truth, as we shall see, is not abstract truth, intellectual truth, dogmatic truth, but the Personal Truth, even the Lord Himself. Truth lodges in the mind only, the mind is its sphere, but nothing in the mind or intellect can give the freedom which the Lord here means. It is the will which must be made free, and this will is far deeper within us than the mind. And this is the work of Christ, the Truth Himself, Who comes within us, to change our wills and make them His.

33. "They answered him, We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage," &c. Considering their captivity in Egypt, and in Babylon, and by the Philistines, and now by the Romans, how could they say "we were never in bondage to any man?" I think the only reference can be to the immunity of the Jew from bondage, so that he should not be a bond-slave in his own land. It is barely possible that there may be some vague remote reference to the history of Hagar and Sarah.

"Jesus answered them . . . whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin." Sin is not a thing the commission of which can be laid aside when we wish, or when it is convenient. It enchains us, and becomes our taskmaster in spite of our reason, our mind, and even our conscience and our faith, if that faith be only intellectual. It is often said that "committeth" does not mean to do an isolated *act*, but to live a *life* of sin; but this is a very perilous interpretation, for any one who sins wilfully shows that sin has power within him, and so he is not yet really free indeed, and must seek a more complete freedom: besides, who knows how far any act of sin can be called "isolated"?

35. "And the servant abideth not in the house for ever: but the Son abideth ever." This difficult verse must be thus paraphrased: Whosoever committeth sin is the slave of sin, and as such cannot

36 [q] If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.

[q] Rom. viii. 2. Gal. v. 1.

---

be a true son of God. If such an one is outwardly an inmate in the house or church of God, as these carnal Jews were, he does not really belong to it as one of the family; he has no real right in it, and at some time will be expelled. Not so the Son, He "abideth ever," because He is the Heir. Our only hope, then, of abiding in the house of God, that is, in the home of His grace and love, whatever outward form it takes, is union with the Son of God, so that we are identified with Him, and so partaking of His Nature and Sonship, partake of His freedom from sin.

"Ye shall be free indeed." This signifies not only freedom from sin, but free citizenship in the Kingdom of God, and so the man, so one with Christ, and partaker of Him, is free indeed, not only truly, but, as the word signifies, essentially free.

Is this freedom, however, a freedom which makes men think that they are above the Church and the Sacraments? Certainly not; for if so it would be a freedom to despise the promises of Christ which are given to the Church, and wrapped up in Sacraments as much as they are in the written word. Freedom does not make men despise food.

I have several times noticed how the words of Christ, which are found only in this Gospel, were seeds which sprung up and fructified in the Church, and were the root of her highest doctrine, though the actual expressions were not put on record till near the time of the departure of the last surviving Apostle. These words of Christ respecting the Son making men free indeed are the root of all that teaching respecting Evangelical and Moral Freedom which permeates St. Paul's Epistles, and is represented in such phrases as "the glorious liberty of the children of God," "the law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death;" "We are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free;" "Jerusalem, which is above, is free." We have the same in St. Peter's Epistle: "Free, and not using your liberty for a cloke of maliciousness." But it is still more decidedly and, we may say, philosophically reproduced in St. James's "Law of Liberty." (Jam. i. 25; ii. 12.)

37. "I know that ye are Abraham's seed." "I know that ye

37 I know that ye are Abraham's seed; but [r]ye seek to kill me, because my word hath no place in you.

38 [s]I speak that which I have seen with my Father: and ye do that which ye have seen with your father.

39 They answered and said unto him, 'Abra-

[r] ch. vii. 19. ver. 40.

[s] ch. iii. 32. & v. 19, 30. & xiv. 10, 24.

[t] Matt. iii. 9. ver. 33.

---

37. "Hath no place in you." "Gaineth no ground" (Alf.); "hath not free course" (Revisers' text).

38. "My Father," ℵ, D., later Uncials, almost all Cursives, old Latin, Syriac; "the Father," B., C., L., Vulg. (Cod. Amiat.).

"Seen" ["ye have seen"], ℵ, D., most later Uncials, most Cursives, Syriac (Peshito), old Latin, Vulg.; "heard," B., C., K., L., 1, 13, 33, 69, 229.

"Your," ℵ, C., D., Vulg., Syriac, most later Uncials and Cursives. B., L. omit.

come of a holy stock, of a noble vine, wholly a right seed." (Jerem. ii. 21.) "I know that ye are the seed of God's friend."

"But ye seek to kill me, because my word hath no place in you." More accurately, doth not advance or progress. If this is spoken to those Jews who believed Him, then it is a proof of the exceeding weakness of their faith; but the words, "ye seek to kill me," cannot well be said of such. In the nature of things men who but a few minutes before had believed that the "Father was always with Him" (29, 30) would not so soon be seeking His Life. May it not be spoken to the whole body of the Jews before Him, among the mass of whom His word made no way, though a few believed?

38. "I speak that which I have seen with my Father: and ye do that," &c. This follows from what He had said before: "Ye are from beneath, I am from above." It is impossible to suppose that the "father" in the second clause, "ye do that which ye have seen [heard] with the father" [pronoun omitted], is God the Father. If "the father" be the true reading, it cannot refer to the same Divine Being as in the first clause: this is certain, because, in the next verse, the Lord denies that they are even the children of Abraham: they are his "seed," but it is a perversion of the word to call them his "children." Heard (ye have heard with your father) is probably the true reading, and is more consonant with the sense. Our Lord, by Divine Intuition, sees and knows what is in God. The children of Satan do not see what is in their father, but are instructed or inspired by him.

39. "They answered and said unto him, Abraham . . . works

ham is our father. Jesus saith unto them, [u] If ye were
[u] Rom. ii. 23. & ix. 7. Gal. iii. 7, 29. Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham.

[x] ver. 37. 40 [x] But now ye seek to kill me, a man that
[y] ver. 26. hath told you the truth, [y] which I have heard of God: this did not Abraham.

41 Ye do the deeds of your father. Then said they to
[z] Is. lxiii. 16. & lxiv. 8. Mal. i. 6. him, We be not born of fornication; [z] we have one Father, *even* God.

[a] 1 John v. 1. 42 Jesus said unto them, [a] If God were your

---

of Abraham." The true children are those who walk in the steps of their parents, and inherit their character. It is a common expression, "he is the true son of his father." In the spiritual sphere, the true sons, who have, and are led by, the Spirit of God, are the only ones who have any real right to the title.

40. "But now ye seek to kill me . . . . this did not Abraham." Abraham did the very opposite. Godet remarks: "Abraham was distinguished by his absolute docility with regard to Divine Truth (Gen. xii. xxii.), and by his reverential affection for those who were its organs (Gen. xiv., Melchizedec; Gen. xviii., the Three Angels). There could not be a greater contrast than between his character and theirs.

"Which I have heard of God." Compare ch. v. 30, "As I hear I judge"—heard in the counsels of the Father. So also He speaks of the Holy Ghost: "He shall not speak of Himself, but whatsoever He shall hear that shall He speak" (ch. xvi. 13).

41. "Ye do the deeds of your father. Then said they to him, We be not," &c. They now perceive that He speaks of spiritual descent, and they at once retort by claiming the highest: "We be not born of fornication," alluding, perhaps, to the unlawful mixture of the Israelites with heathen, which produced so heterodox a race as the Samaritans. "We have one Father, even God." God had Himself owned them as His children in the sense of having nourished them and brought them up—"I have nourished and brought up children" (Isaiah i. 2)—but they had by their sins degraded themselves, so as to have become the children of God's enemy.

42. "Jesus said unto them, If God were your Father, ye would

Father, ye would love me: [b] for I proceeded forth and came from God; [c] neither came I of myself, but he sent me.

[b] ch. xvi. 27. & xvii. 8, 25.
[c] ch. v. 43. & vii. 28, 29.

43 [d] Why do ye not understand my speech? *even* because ye cannot hear my word.

[d] ch. vii. 17.

---

42. "Came." "Am come" (Alf., Revisers).
"Neither came I." "Neither have I come" (Revisers).

love me: for," &c. Jesus at once denies the reality of their sonship. Those who are in very deed the children of God by resembling Him in character must of necessity love One Who so perfectly reflected the image of the Father as did Jesus. If they, as they boasted, were the children of God, by deriving their spiritual being from Him, they must recognize the Mission and Person of One Who in the highest sense proceeded forth and was come from God; and Who, besides this, was sent by God to "gather together in one all the children of God." Stier has a valuable remark: "This is the abiding and decisive protest against the rationalism which honours the All-Father, and sets Jesus aside; against all who imagine that they believe in God, and think to be His children, while their cold, loveless, or unfriendly relations to Christ makes it plain that their faith in God and their filial presumption are based upon a wrong foundation."

43. "Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word." Speech (*lalia*) is the outward form, the language, the manner of what is communicated; word (*logos*) is the doctrine, the substance, the thing communicated in the speech. "Every God-fearing man, when the Spirit of God begins to speak, hears Him speak in his own tongue: this preparation of spirit is the fundamental condition for hearing and understanding aright, and where it is wanting all the highest words are spoken to the wind or into deaf ears. Love understands, even desire perceives and anticipates the meaning." "Moreover it is to be understood that this *lalia*, which those born in God's house will recognize, is not to be applied merely to the external use of language, but is to be viewed spiritually, as referring to those fundamental ideas, those spiritual truths, those eternal promises which are spoken by God to the mind and heart of a man, and the tones of which he at once catches and comprehends. He who understands in his heart these two words,

44 [e] Ye are of *your* father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and [f] abode not in the truth, because

[e] Matt. xiii. 38. 1 John iii. 8.
[f] Jude 6.

---

44. "Ye will do." "Ye will to do;" *vultis facere.*
"Abode not." "Standeth not" (Alf.), or "stood not;" *non stetit* (Vulg.).

"sin" and "grace," which no human lexicon can make perfectly plain, will not be at a loss in any of the idioms of Christianity, will not be baffled even by the hard saying of "the eating and drinking of the flesh and blood." (Stier.)

44. "Ye are of your father the devil." Literally, of the father the devil. He had been speaking of the Father Who was the author of that truth and goodness which was in Him, and the father who was the author of the malice and falsehood which was in them. The One was the Father God, the other was the father Satan. Satan was not their father as the author of their existence, but the author of that which then dominated in them—their evil.

"The lusts of your father ye will do," ye desire to do, ye are bent on doing. The lust of Satan was to destroy the work of God; the lust of the Jews, as his children, was to destroy the work of God in Christ.

"He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not [stands not] in the truth." Many suppose that the reference here is to the murder of Abel by Cain, who is expressly said to be "of that wicked one;" but does not the mention of "not standing in the truth," and of "lying," which immediately succeeds, point rather to the murder of the soul and body—the whole nature of man, by the temptation of Eve, because it was that which was at "the beginning"? The murder of Abel was the consequence of the destruction of the life of God in our first parents; and this was brought about by a lie. In that first lie Satan "spake of his own" out of the boundless hatred which dwelt in him to all that were of God; and so especially to that work of God which he saw at a glance to be made "in God's image after His Likeness." This lie he was prompted to speak—it had its origin in the hatred, the spirit of murder, the lust to destroy which was in Satan towards God, and so to all that was of God, as Adam then was. An extraordinary exposition of this "speaking of his own" is given by Godet: "Deriving nothing from Divine truth, Satan draws all that he says from his own resources—

there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it.

---

44. "Of it," or "of him." See below.

that is to say, from the nothingness of his own subjectivity, for the creature, apart from God, is incapable of possessing or originating anything real." But, surely, this superfine intellectualism utterly "darkens counsel," for, instead of Satan's subjectivity being nothingness, it is indomitable hatred to God. This hatred has now become the root of his spiritual being. It inspires him with the lust of destroying the work of God. It made him cast about for all means of doing so; and so he put forth the wicked lie which effected his purpose. What the original spring of Satan's fall was, God has not revealed; but it made him from the beginning "a murderer," full of hatred to God, and so full of "lust" to efface the image of God in man.

When it is said "he stands not in the truth," must not this mean "he stands not in God, and in the Word of God, Who is the Revelation of the truth of God?" And this because "there is no truth in him." He has put God from him, he stands apart from God, and so has no truth, because there is nothing of God in him. No doubt he knows God intellectually; no doubt he knows the truth of God's nature—the Fatherhood and the Sonship, and the Love that there is between the Three Persons, and the desire of God to produce His own likeness in all His intelligent creatures; but he hates all this which he knows, and would destroy it all if he could. And this is his falsehood. It is his negation of the Personal Truth, and his desire that it should not exist; and so in him falsehood and hatred are one, by opposition to God the Truth. In him all evil is one, just as in God all good is one.

"For he is a liar, and the father of it." There is an ambiguity in this. It may be "he is a liar, and the father of him," *i.e.*, of the liar; or "of it," that is, of the falsehood which is the character of the liar. The latter seems preferable, for he is only the father of the liar by being the author of the falseness which makes him a liar.

This place is one of the most decided in Scripture for the personality of Satan. It is surprising how the personal existence of an author of evil can ever have been doubted by those who believe that there are such things as moral good and evil, as distinguished from

45 And because I tell *you* the truth, ye believe me not.

46 Which of you convinceth me of sin? And if I say the truth, why do ye not believe me?

---

physical pleasure and pain. If we deny the existence of a devil, *i.e.*, of a personal author of evil, we must believe that sin has had its source in unconscious matter of some sort, which it must have had if it had not its origin in the breast of some intelligence.

45. "And because I tell you the truth, ye believe me not." They believed Him not, because the truth He had been telling them was unwelcome to them. But what truth had He been pressing upon them? No other than His Divine claims as working with the Father, seeing what was in the Father, teaching what He had learnt in the bosom of the Father. They ostensibly rejected these high supernatural pretensions as blasphemy, but they really rejected them because the nearer the Lord claimed to be to the Eternal Father, the greater His demands on their obedience, and the less likely that He should be the carnal Messiah which they desired.

46. "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" None but a sinless Being, One Who was wholly unconscious of any deviation from the good and the right within Him, would be able to say this. "Had He been merely a supereminently holy man, with a conscience as tender as such a degree of sanctity implies, He would not have suffered the smallest sin, whether in His Life or Heart, to pass unperceived; and what hypocrisy it would, in this case, have been to put to others a question whose favourable solution would have rested only on their ignorance of facts which He Himself knew to be real!" (Godet.)

It is, however, very improbable that He meant by these words to assert dogmatically His own sinlessness. He rather spoke, as we should say, naturally. "You know nothing whatsoever against Me which should make you doubt the holiness of My character, and so give occasion to question what I say."

"And if I say the truth, why do ye not believe me?" This seems to be asked, not by way of expostulation, but catechetically, as it were, and to enable Him in the next verse to give the true reason: "Ye therefore hear them not [My words and so God's words], because ye are not of God."

47 [g] He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear *them* not, because ye are not of God.

[g] ch. x. 26, 27. 1 John iv. 6.

47. "He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not," &c. Here we have from the lips of Incarnate Wisdom the real reason for the rejection of the Person and Message of Christ. Nor is this less true of those who reject Christ in this day, than it was of those who were rejecting Him then? It is certainly put forth by our Lord as a truth of universal application and reception. It presupposes, of course, that His claims are known, and that they are commended by the lives, and by the earnestness, and by the unanimity of those who represent Him. And we humbly trust that many who, in this age, reject the Christ of the Bible, do so because of the very imperfect witness of the Church—because of her imperfect holiness and her divisions. But putting this aside as not touching the principle here enunciated by the Lord, we ask what is the reason why a scientific man is sceptical respecting the claims of Christ? It is because he puts the natural and the temporal before the moral and the eternal. He is quite content that virtue and goodness should come from beneath—that is, should be the outcome of natural forces—not from above, *i.e.*, from God; he is quite content that there should be no Eternal Justice anywhere in the Universe, no future state of reward for the good and punishment for the bad; he is quite content that mankind should never be redeemed from the dominion of sin, and that death should reign for ever over good and bad alike. Now he that is "of God" is not content with all this. He desires that goodness and righteousness should proceed from a Supreme Being Who will assert their claims, and not from unconscious natural laws or forces, which know not and care not for what proceeds from them. He desires that there should be somewhere an Eternal Justice which will reward in another state that which is not rewarded, but rather persecuted, in this. He desires that men should be no longer the bondslaves of sin, but should be redeemed, redeemed into a state of freedom, to live according to what is highest within them, not according to what is lowest. He desires this and cannot be content without it, and so he looks out for it, and finds unmistakable evidence for it, not in Chemistry or Physiology, but where it is most likely to be found, *i.e.*, in the history of the race which requires judgment and redemption. He finds it in the centre of that history, and in the most

48 Then answered the Jews, and said unto him, Say we not well that thou art a Samaritan, and [h] hast a devil?

[h] ch. vii. 20. & x. 20. ver. 52.

49 Jesus answered, I have not a devil; but I honour my Father, and ye do dishonour me.

50 And [i] I seek not mine own glory: there is one that seeketh and judgeth.

[i] ch. v. 41 & vii. 18.

---

commanding and attractive character which has ever appeared in that history. He finds it in the faith of Jesus of Nazareth. And this because he is "of God."

If the ideas of Goodness and Righteousness, and Eternal Justice and Redemption, are of God, such a man is "of God." In writing this we do not judge any individual sceptic; we do not deny, rather we earnestly hope that God will make every allowance for the deficient witness of the Church, which, through her worldliness and her divisions, has so imperfectly commended the truth to those to whom she has had to proclaim it, but we must assert what Christ asserts, that a man hears not the words of God, because he is "not of God."

48. "Then answered the Jews, and said unto him, Say we not well that thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil?" Certainly the bitterest and most malicious words they could apply to him. "Thou art a Samaritan" means: "Thou art born of spiritual fornication, Thou art of an outcast race, Thou art an alien from the Church and worship of God."

"And hast a devil." Whatever the word "daimonion" may have meant among the heathen, on the lips of these men it assuredly means an unclean spirit.

49. "Jesus answered, I have not a devil; but I honour my Father, and ye," &c. Notice that He does not repel the charge of being a Samaritan. "How could He take the name of mockery, which involved in contempt a people called to salvation, upon His lips, and by repelling it, sanction the injustice done to those whom He had already treated with grace?" (Stier.)

50. "And I seek not mine own glory: there is one that seeketh and judgeth." "I seek not mine own glory," I refer all my works, all My teaching, all My judgment, to the Father.

"There is one that seeketh and judgeth;" but though glory from

51 Verily, verily, I say unto you, [k] If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death.

[k] ch. v. 24. & xi. 26.

52 Then said the Jews unto him, Now we know that thou hast a devil. [l] Abraham is dead, and the prophets; and thou sayest, If a man keep my saying, he shall never taste of death.

[l] Zech. i. 5. Heb. xi. 13.

men is a matter of indifference to Me, there is One that seeketh and judgeth—there is One Who seeks that men should honour Me as they honour Him, and will judge those who withhold from Me the honour due to Me.

51. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death." There is some difficulty in making out the connection between these words and those of the fiftieth verse. Some suppose that He now ceased speaking to the "Jews," and addressed Himself to the believers only. The words seem to follow on those of verse 31. There we read: "If ye continue in my words . . . the truth shall make you free," and He proceeds from freedom from sin to freedom from death. "If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death." All between verse 31 and this verse may be regarded as an interruption, and the discourse respecting the privilege of those who continue in Christ's word is renewed.

"He shall never see death." This is explained by Augustine and Cyril, of everlasting death. "That," saith Augustine, "is indeed death, for this death of ours is but a migration." By others they have been taken as meaning, shall not know what death is. It will be to him only a sleep. And this is the very name which our Lord gave to natural death. When Lazarus was already dead He said, "Our friend Lazarus sleepeth, but I go that I may awake him out of sleep." Such a hold had this truth on St. Paul that he not only described the death of the saints as "sleeping in Jesus" (1 Thess. iv. 14), but he speaks of Jesus as having "abolished death" (2 Tim. i. 10).

To keep Christ's word (*logos*) is more than merely to obey His precepts. It is to keep the whole truth respecting Him (the Catholic faith) in mind and heart, and to feed on it by holy meditation, and to endeavour to live as one who holds such things.

52. "Then said the Jews unto him, Now we know that thou hast a devil." Some commentators speak of the change of the word

53 Art thou greater than our father Abraham, which is dead? and the prophets are dead: whom makest thou thyself?

54 Jesus answered, [m] If I honour myself, my honour is nothing: [n] it is my Father that honoureth me; of whom ye say, that he is your God:

55 Yet [o] ye have not known him; but I know him: and if I should say, I know him not, I shall

[m] ch. v. 31.

[n] ch. v. 41. & xvi. 14. & xvii. 1. Acts iii. 13.

[o] ch. vii. 28, 29.

---

54. "Your God." ℵ, B., D., F., Vulg., old Latin, read "your;" A., C., L., later Uncials, Cursives, Vulg. (Cod. Amiat.), and Syriac read "our."

"see" into "taste" as a malicious perversion. Others, on the contrary, see no difference. Thus Luthardt: "When they put the verb 'to taste' in the place of 'to see' there is no substantial difference; the latter (to see) designates the outward experience, the former (to taste) the inward life in the feelings."

53. "Art thou greater than our father . . . whom makest thou thyself?" The Jews were not mistaken when they accused Him of making Himself greater than Abraham. No doubt the Father Who ordered all the words that His Son was to say and speak (xii. 49), foresaw that the dispute would take this turn, and so give occasion to our Lord to utter by far the most distinct intimation of His pre-existence which had as yet been given by Him.

54, 55. "Jesus answered, If I honour myself, my honour is nothing . . . but I know him, and keep his saying." These two verses seem in a parenthesis, the answer to the question "Art thou greater than our father Abraham?" coming in the next verse (56). The Lord, in verses 55, 56, answers the taunt, "whom makest thou thyself?" as if He bore witness to or glorified Himself, which before He had so earnestly disclaimed. Here he again disclaims such a thing. "If I glorify myself, my glory is nothing: it is my Father which glorifieth me," which "glory" is the witness which God gave to Him by prophecy and miracle, and would shortly be increased immeasurably by His Resurrection and Ascension, and the descent of the Holy Ghost; "yet ye have not known him, or ye would have known me."

"And if I should say, I know him not, I should be a liar like unto you." How is it that our Lord contemplates, even for a

be a liar like unto you: but I know him, and keep his saying.

56 Your father Abraham [p] rejoiced to see my day: [q] and he saw *it*, and was glad.

[p] Luke x. 24.
[q] Heb. xi. 13.

---

56. "To see my day;" rather, "that he should see;" *exultavit ut videret* (Vulg.)

moment, that He should deny His knowledge of the Father? We may explain the matter thus. He seeks not to glorify Himself, but He must assert, His own Truth compels Him to assert, that what He teaches, both respecting Himself and the Father, arises out of the most intimate knowledge of God. It is not *His* doctrine, it is what He has seen in the Father, heard of the Father, learned of the Father. This He must say. He cannot and must not deny, no matter what opposition it excites, that no prophet, no patriarch, no saint of God, has known the Father as He has. He must for their sakes tell them that the immeasurable distance between them and Him consists in this, that they have not learnt of God even what they might have done if they had followed faithfully the light vouchsafed to them, whilst He knew God essentially and intimately, because One with God. If He were to conceal this, which was that on which all His claims rested, but which excited their utmost enmity—if He were to conceal this, much more if He were to deny it, He would be as false as they were; but He says, "I know him, and keep his saying." What is this saying or word (*logos*) which our Lord here says that He keeps? It must, I think, mean that which He alludes to in xii. 49. "I have not spoken of myself, but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should do and what I should speak," or it may allude to a deeper thing still. The Lord in His discourse in the tenth chapter speaks of His laying down and taking again His Life as "a commandment received from His Father." Now it was the assertion of His Divine claims which directly led to the taking away of His Life, and so "keeping God's saying" was on His part the setting forth of everything and the concealment of nothing told Him by the Father, even though what He set forth was the reason for His Crucifixion.

56. "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day." In these words the Lord has respect, first, to their assertion that Abraham, who they supposed could not have kept the word of One Who lived so long after him, was dead; and secondly, that our Lord made Himself

57 Then said the Jews unto him, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?

58 Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, [r] I am.

r Ex. iii. 14. Is. xliii. 13. ch. xvii. 5, 24. Col. i. 17. Rev. i. 8.

greater than Abraham. The Lord meets their inference that the fact of Abraham having died falsifies these words of His, by telling them that Abraham, so far as it was possible for him, kept Christ's word. By a realizing faith in God's promises respecting his Seed, in which all the nations of the earth were to be blessed, he overcame death, for he rejoiced that he should see Christ's day, and so death would be to him deprived of its sting. The words should not be rendered, "rejoiced to see," but "rejoiced that he should see." He rejoiced in the belief that even if he were in the unseen world God would reveal to him the day of Christ.

The day of Christ is properly the time of Christ's coming into the world, but as the completion of Christ's whole redemptive work on earth was involved in His Incarnation and Birth (for what God had undertaken in so wondrous a way He could certainly carry out) we may take it that the seeing the day of Christ includes the seeing of His Life, Death, Resurrection, and Second Coming.

"He saw it, and was glad." This does not mean in prophetic vision, but that in his place in Paradise God made him to know His Son's Incarnation and Birth. How he saw it we know not, for we do not know the conditions under which God makes known things occurring in this world to the spirits in the separate state: but we have here Christ's word that Abraham *saw* it and was glad. This seems to imply more than that he was told of it. In some unknown way he *saw* it. This answered by implication the question of the Jews, "Art thou greater than our father Abraham?" He was infinitely greater because He was the object of Abraham's faith and hope, and religious joy.

57. "Then said the Jews unto him, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast," &c. Our Lord then must have been under thirty-two or thirty-three. It is conjectured that owing to His Life of sorrow at the rejection of His own and His Father's word, He had the appearance of being much older.

58. "Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before

59 Then [s]took they up stones to cast at him: but Jesus hid himself, and went out of the temple, [t]going through the midst of them, and so passed by.

[s] ch. x. 31, 39. & xi. 8.
[t] Luke iv. 30.

---

59 "Going through the midst of them, and so passed by," omitted by א, B., D., old Latin, Vulg.; retained by A., C., L., X., later Uncials, Cursives, and Syriac.

Abraham was, I am." Not "I was," but "I am." If he had said "I was" it might have been taken to mean that He came into existence some time before Abraham, but "I am" signifies eternal being. By saying this of Himself He claims to be "the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity" of Isaiah; the One "whose goings forth have been from of old, of everlasting," of Micah; the Personal Wisdom "whom the Lord possessed in the beginning of his way, and before his works of old, Who was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the world was," of Solomon. "As the Father useth this expression 'I am,' so also doth Christ: for it signifies continuous-being irrespective of all time" (Chrysostom). That He used the words as asserting, not simply pre-existence, but Divine Eternal Existence, is evident from the conduct of the Jews.

59. "Then took they up stones to cast at him." If He had not been Divine in His Nature He was bound to disabuse them. If He had said the words in any of the utterly unreal senses in which they are now understood by Rationalists or Socinians, His truth would have compelled Him to explain Himself; for they believed that He had, by what He said, committed the worst crime in their law, that of blasphemy; but by His silence He accepted their interpretation. Instead of explaining His words so as to rebut the charge, He withdrew Himself in some unknown way. The words going "through the midst of them, and so passing by," are somewhat doubtful, but that under the eyes of an enraged multitude and in a public building, He hid Himself in some ordinary way seems impossible. He acted, no doubt, by the same exercise of superior power as once in Nazareth He passed through a multitude who were bent on destroying Him. (Luke iv. 30.)

CHAP. IX.

AND as *Jesus* passed by, he saw a man which was blind from *his* birth.

---

1. "And as *Jesus* passed by, he saw a man which was blind from his birth." Whether this took place immediately on His going out of the temple, mentioned in the last verse of chapter viii., is uncertain. It is not unlikely, and if so, there is a very suggestive parallel between the account which follows and that in St. Luke iv. 36, in which our Lord is said to have "passed through" the midst of those who were seeking His life; for, in both cases, our Lord passed immediately from danger which threatened His Life to the performance of works of mercy. Thus, from that hill of Nazareth He went straight down to Capernaum, and healed in their synagogue a man who had a spirit of an unclean devil, just as on the present occasion, as He passed out of the temple, He wrought the wonderful miracle of the opening the eyes of the man born blind.

"He saw a man," &c. He must have stopped to observe him. No doubt He had a secret intimation from His Father that there was now a special work for Him to do. He looked at him attentively, so that the attention of the disciples was also directed to the blind man. Unbelievers and wilful sinners are blind, and are unable to see and to come to Christ, so that Christ must first look upon them, and give them the light in which they may see Him.

"Blind from his birth," and so his case was held to be hopeless. Because no instance had been known of the restoration of sight to one born blind, His enemies investigate the case by sending for his parents. His questioners can allege nothing against what he says in verse 32, "Since the world began, was it not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind."

2. "And his disciples asked him," &c. The Jews regarded all physical evil as the punishment of sin. The words of the Lord to the impotent man whom He had healed (ch, v. 14), may have

2 And his disciples asked him, saying, Master, [a] who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind?

[a] ver. 34.

3 Jesus answered, Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents: [b] but that the works of God should be made manifest in him.

[b] ch. xi. 4.

4 [c] I must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work.

[c] ch. iv. 34. & v. 19, 36. & xi. 9. & xii. 35 & xvii. 4.

---

3. "Neither hath this man sinned." Better, "Neither did this man sin," *i.e.* so as to bring upon him blindness (Alford and Revisers).

4. "I must work." So A., C., most later Uncials, all Cursives, old Latin, Vulg., Syriac. "We must work," ℵ, B., D., L. Origen also seems to read "we."

"Sent me." So A., B., C. "Sent us," ℵ, L.

suggested the inquiry, "Who committed sin, this man, or his parents?" That the children were punished for the sin of the parents in cases of idolatry is certain from the second commandment, "Visiting the sins of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me." But how could the man himself have sinned? Only, of course, in a former state of existence. Josephus very clearly asserts that the Pharisees, who were the most popular religious sect, believed in the pre-existence of souls. "They say that all souls are incorruptible, but that the souls of good men only are removed into other bodies, but that the souls of bad men are subject to eternal punishment." ("Wars," ii. 8, 14.) It has been asserted that this quotation is not to the point, because Josephus speaks only of the souls of good men after death being born again in other bodies; but probably he states the doctrine very loosely, and this man may be supposed not to have been such a wicked man as to deserve eternal punishment, but one who had committed in his previous life some sin which required expiation.

The Lord, in His answer, in no sense allows the doctrine, but asserts the real reason for the man's blindness—that the works of God might be made manifest in him; first, in the restoration of his organs of sight, and then in the illumination of his soul by the faith of Christ. See also xi. 4.

4. "I must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day: the night," &c. The "day" of Christ here is the time of His

5 As long as I am in the world, [d] I am the light of the world.

6 When he had thus spoken, [e] he spat on the ground, and made clay of the spittle, and he

[d] ch. i. 5, 9. & iii. 19. & viii. 12. & xii. 35, 46.
[e] Mark vii. 33. & viii. 23.

5. "As long as I am." Alford and Revisers, "When I am;" *Quamdiu* (Vulg.).

sojourn here in the flesh. During this time He had works to do in manifesting His Father's glory, and attaching to Himself those whom the Father had given to Him (xvii. 4, 6), which could not be done after He left the world. So this was His "day" of work —His day for working in humiliation, and disappointment, and tears: the night of rest would soon come in which He must cease from these works, and enter upon a new sphere of Divine action altogether.

Much has been made of the reading of the Neutral Text, "*We* must work the works of Him that sent me." It has been used to show how Jesus associates his disciples with Himself in all His working; but this can hardly be the significance if it be genuine, for His day of work was about to be cut short by His departure, and then, and not till then, His disciples would enter upon their true and abiding work, as is manifest from chap. xv. 16 (which certainly looks to the future after His departure). Godet asks, "Is it not" [the reading "me"] "evidently a correction intended to generalize the application of verse 4, and to change this saying into an exhortation addressed to the disciples?" Besides, the incongruity of "*we* must work the works of him that sent *me*." Some MSS., however, ℵ and L, follow on the first correction by reading "us;" but surely we must not confound the sending of Christ and that of his Apostles. "As my Father sent me, so send I you." (John xx.)

5. "As long as I am in the world." "Whilst I am in the world, I am the light of the world;" and so He proceeded to perform a miracle, which parabolically teaches us how he conveys His light to us. He does it by giving to us new organs of vision, or at least by wholly renewing what organs of spiritual vision we have.

6. "When he had thus spoken, he spat on the ground, and made clay," &c. What is the significance of this act? for significance it must have. The mixture of earth and spittle could not, of course, have the smallest natural effect on the eye, except to inflame it. If

‖ anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay,

7 And said unto him, Go, wash [f] in the pool of Siloam, (which is by interpretation, Sent.) [g] He went his way therefore, and washed, and came seeing.

‖ Or, *spread the clay upon the eyes of the blind man.*
[f] Neh. iii. 15.
[g] See 2 Kings v. 14.

6. "He anointed the eyes of the blind man," &c. See margin. *Linivit lutum super oculos ejus* (Vulg.).

the eye had been simply diseased, it would have retarded any natural mode of cure instead of assisting it. It is to be noticed that on two other occasions, both recorded in St. Mark, the Lord applied His spittle—once to the tongue (Mark vii. 33), once to the blind eyes (viii. 23).

It has never been sufficiently noticed how frequently the Lord heals men by contact with His own Body.[1] But here He goes further. He heals by an emanation from His Body. The following extract seems to point out where the true significance lies:—"He wishes us to believe that through the instrumentality of things which are, as it were, bodily, He bestows spiritual effects (though He can give such effects if He chooses without them); as through the application of water He bestows regeneration, so in this place through clay, and the washing of it off, He gave light to the eyes of the body." (Estius.)

7. "And said to him, Go, wash in the pool of Siloam," &c. The pool of Siloam (*i.e.*, the upper pool) receives its water through the canal or tunnel from the Fountain of the Virgin. This is the tunnel in which the remarkable Hebrew inscription has lately been discovered. This fountain, which seems to come from under the most sacred part of Jerusalem (for it gushes forth from between Zion and Moriah, at the foot of the height upon which God and the house of David had their seat), is taken by Isaiah to be a type of salvation through the house of David. "The water of Siloah that flows gently," is in contrast to the strong and destructive stream of the worldly power in Isaiah viii. 6.

The words "which is by interpretation Sent" are thrown in by the Evangelist to show that he considered that the action of Jesus

[1] Matt. viii. 3, 15; ix. 21, 22, 25, 29; xiv. 36; Mark vii. 33; Luke vii. 14; xxii. 51, &c.

8 ¶ The neighbours therefore, and they which before had seen him that he was blind, said, Is not this he that sat and begged?

9 Some said, This is he: others *said*, He is like him: *but* he said, I am *he*.

10 Therefore said they unto him, How were thine eyes opened?

---

8. "That he was blind." "That he was a beggar," ℵ, A., B., C., D., K., L., a few Cursives, Vulg., Coptic, Sah., Syriacs, &c.; but later Uncials and most Cursives read as in Received Text.

9. "Others said, He is like him." ℵ, B., C., L. read, "No, but he is like him." So Vulg., *Nequaquam sed similis est ei*; Syriac, *Non, sed prorsus similis est ei*; A., D., most later Uncials, old Latin as in the Textus Receptus.

in sending the man to wash in the pool, was typical. The pool typified the Lord. It had the same name of "Sent." The spring which supplied it, now known to be an intermittent one, would seem at that age to be sent directly by God at such intervals as it pleased Him, for the refreshment of His people. All this occurred to the Evangelist, and by this sentence, explaining the meaning of the word, he would show us that the restoration of eye-sight is but the shadow of a restoration of a higher power of sight, by washing in the Fountain open for sin and uncleanness. Some may despise this typical mode of teaching, but there can be no doubt but that it implants God's truth more firmly and deeply in the minds of the vast majority of unlearned and simple-minded believers, than any other.

8. "The neighbours therefore, and they which before had seen him," &c. No doubt the reading "a mendicant" is the true one.

9. "Some said, This is he," &c. How could there be much question about the identity of one who had sat begging in a thronged thoroughfare? No doubt because his features were somewhat altered by his restoration to sight. The opened eyes had altered his look. No account can possibly present more marks of being the narration of one who was on the spot than all this.

10. "Therefore said they unto him, How were thine eyes opened?" It is very far-fetched to see, as some do, in this question, a sign of their malignity, because they did not ask, "Who opened thine eyes?" rather than "How were thine eyes opened?" How could they guess that any *person* had done it?

11 He answered and said, [h] A man that is called Jesus made clay, and anointed mine eyes, and said unto me, Go to the pool of Siloam, and wash: and I went and washed, and I received sight.

[h] ver. 6, 7.

12 Then said they unto him, Where is he? He said, I know not.

13 ¶ They brought to the Pharisees him that aforetime was blind.

14 And it was the sabbath day when Jesus made the clay, and opened his eyes.

---

11. "I received sight." Literally, "I became again seeing" (Meyer); "I recovered sight." See below.

11. "He answered and said, A man that is called Jesus," &c. Perhaps, "*the* man which is called Jesus," assuming Him to be well known.

"I received sight," rather, I recovered sight, because blindness, even though a man may have been born with it, is not the natural state of a human being. In his perfect state, a man possesses eyesight. So the miracle may be said to have restored him to his natural state.

12. "Then said they unto him, Where is he?" &c. This remark, apparently of no importance, serves to show that the narrator was either present, or heard even the most trifling matters, probably from the man himself.

13. "They brought to the Pharisees him that aforetime was blind." Either to some court which had the power of excommunication, and which was composed chiefly of Pharisees, or to the leading members of the sect, who were men of influence in the Sanhedrim. Some think that the important sect of the Pharisees had a certain organization, and that the Pharisees here mentioned were the chosen representatives.

14. "And it was the sabbath day." Mr. Blunt cites some extracts from the Mishna to show that even lifting up a handful of earth on the Sabbath was held to be a breach of the law. It was also expressly forbidden to put spittle on the eyelids on the Sabbath. The kneading of the clay would be an aggravation of the offence. It is humiliating to cite such absurdities; but similar

15 Then again the Pharisees also asked him how he had received his sight. He said unto them, He put clay upon mine eyes, and I washed, and do see.

16 Therefore said some of the Pharisees, This man is not of God, because he keepeth not the Sabbath day. Others said, [i] How can a man that is a sinner do such miracles? And [k] there was a division among them.

[i] ver. 33. ch. iii. 2.
[k] ch. vii. 12, 43. & x. 19.

17 They say unto the blind man again, What sayest thou of him, that he hath opened thine eyes? He said, [l] He is a prophet.

[l] ch. iv. 19. & vi. 14.

---

instances could be given from the annals of Sabbatarianism in this country.

15. "Then again the Pharisees also asked him how he had . . . I washed, and do see." It has been noticed how the blind man described only what he felt. He did not see the spitting on the ground, and the making clay with the spittle, and so was not struck by it, even if told of it.

16. "Then said some of the Pharisees, This man is not of God . . . Others said," &c. "Then said some," &c. They ignored the benignant miracle which had given sight to one born blind, and looked only at the apparent infringement of some additions to the law, which were all of their own making, for God, whilst ordaining the Sabbath that the labourer should have a day of rest and refreshment, never intended that the loosing of burdens on one day of the week should itself, by the perverseness of man, be made an intolerable one.

"Others said, How can a man that is a sinner," &c. These men looked rather at the goodness and power displayed in the miracle. "Jesus trampled not on the Mosaic Sabbath, but on its Pharisaic caricature" (Godet). There was a division among them.

17. "They say unto the blind man again." It is because of the difference between the two parties that most probably the party who favoured Jesus had the man brought forward again, that he might bear his testimony, and so vindicate them for seeming to take his part; but observe the greater boldness of the man: though he knew that many of them had condemned Jesus as "not of God," he

18 But the Jews did not believe concerning him, that he had been blind, and received his sight, until they called the parents of him that had received his sight.

19 And they asked them, saying, Is this your son, who ye say was born blind? how then doth he now see?

20 His parents answered them and said, We know that this is our son, and that he was born blind:

21 But by what means he now seeth, we know not; or who hath opened his eyes, we know not: he is of age; ask him: he shall speak for himself.

22 These *words* spake his parents, because [m] they feared the Jews: for the Jews had agreed already, that if any man did confess that he was Christ, he [n] should be put out of the synagogue.

[m] ch. vii. 13. & xii. 42. & xix. 38. Acts v. 13.

[n] ver. 34. ch. xvi. 2.

---

manfully confesses what he thought—that his benefactor was a prophet.

18. "But the Jews did not believe concerning him, that," &c. The Jews, or hostile party, hoping to weaken the effect of the miracle, call the parents of the man, and ask them three questions. Is this your son? Do ye say that he was born blind? How doth he now see? The parents acknowledge that he was their son, and that he was born blind, but decline to answer the third question, fearing the dominant party.

21. "By what means he now seeth, we know not; or who hath opened his eyes, we know not: he is of age; ask him: he shall speak for himself." The cowardice and ingratitude of these persons is remarkable, seeing that their son had received so signal a benefit, but multitudes of the Jews shared with them in this evil mind. Their testimony, however, was amply sufficient to convince or convict the Pharisees. It was their son, and they knew that he had been born blind. Their testimony was not needed to confirm the fact of the miracle, as they had not seen it performed. That was clear from the evidence of the man himself, and from that of the persons who a day or two before had seen him as a blind beggar.

22. "These words said his parents, because they feared the Jews," &c. The Jews, *i.e.*, the authorities, not only had it in their inten-

23 Therefore said his parents, He is of age; ask him.

24 Then again called they the man that was blind, and said unto him, [o] Give God the praise: [p] we know that this man is a sinner.

[o] Josh. vii. 19. 1 Sam. vi. 5.
[p] ver. 16.

25 He answered and said, Whether he be a sinner *or no*, I know not: one thing I know, that whereas I was blind, now I see.

---

tion, but had already determined upon a decree of exclusion, and no doubt had made it known. If they were only intending, as some think, their intention would not have overawed men as these parents of the blind man were overawed.

"Put out of the synagogue." This was exclusion from all religious privileges, and also from all social intercourse even with their family, for thirty days.

24. "Then called they again the man . . . give God the praise," &c. "Give God the praise." This has been taken as a sort of adjuration, but without sufficient reason. It seems an adjuration in Joshua vii. 19, but is used with no such intention in Jeremiah xiii. 16. It seems most natural to understand it as an hypocritical assumption of piety by these wicked men. "You have been restored to sight; give God the praise, and not this man, whom we know to be a blasphemer and a Sabbath-breaker, and so, however He may have done this miracle, not likely to be sent by God as a prophet."

25. "He answered and said, Whether he be a sinner or no, I know not," &c. There was no use trying to convince a man who had experienced such a miracle of power and goodness that his deliverer was from beneath, not from above. He said in effect: "Could the powers of evil restore to me my sight, and can restoration of sight to any one born blind come from any one but God?" This place suggests the one all-sufficient answer by which the true Christian can meet (so far as his own soul is concerned) the attack of the infidel. The converted heathen in the first ages could say to his unbelieving neighbours, "I was blind, now I see." "I have experienced a miracle of grace within myself which no one but a God of supreme goodness and truth could bring about." And now the true Christian, even though he may have experienced no sudden enlightening, but may have grown up in the realization of the faith of Christ, can say to the sceptic, "All your arguments from this

26 Then said they to him again, What did he to thee? how opened he thine eyes?

27 He answered them, I have told you already, and ye did not hear: wherefore would ye hear *it* again? will ye also be his disciples?

28 Then they reviled him, and said, Thou art his disciple; but we are Moses' disciples.

29 We know that God spake unto Moses: *as for* this *fellow*, [q] we know not from whence he is. [q] ch. viii. 14.

30 The man answered and said unto them, [r] Why herein is a marvellous thing, that ye know not from whence he is, and *yet* he hath opened mine eyes. [r] ch. iii. 10.

---

27. "Ye did not hear." Old Latin and Vulg., "Ye heard," omitting "not."

lower world of mere nature are nothing to me. I see a spiritual and eternal world above and behind nature, of which you seem to have no conception. I have as little doubt of its reality as I have of my own existence, for I have experienced its powers."

26. "Then said they to him again," &c. This second questioning was probably intended to bring out some flaw or discrepancy in the narrative, or perhaps some further circumstance which might form ground of accusation against our Lord.

27. "I have told you already," &c. He answers impatiently and with marked contempt, perceiving that it was not a desire to get at the truth, but malice, which dictated their question.

"Will ye also be his disciples?" This was said in irony, but it seems to imply that he considered himself to be a disciple or follower of our Lord, or is, at least, willing to be one.

28. "Then they reviled him . . . we are Moses' disciples." And yet they were grossly mistaken. "Had ye believed Moses," the Lord had said to them, "ye would have believed me" (ch. v. 46).

29. "We know that God spake unto Moses." How did they know that God spake unto Moses? Only by the mighty works which God did by him, and by the wisdom and holiness of the Law which God sent him to teach; and by these same marks they might have known that Jesus was of God.

30. "The man answered and said unto them, Why herein is a

31 Now we know that [s] God heareth not sinners: but if any man be a worshipper of God, and doeth his will, him he heareth.

32 Since the world began was it not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind.

33 [t] If this man were not of God, he could do nothing.

34 They answered and said unto him, [u] Thou wast altogether born in sins, and dost thou teach us? And they || cast him out.

[s] Job xxvii. 9. & xxxv. 12. Ps. xviii. 41. & xxxiv. 15. & lxvi. 18. Prov. i. 28. & xv. 29. & xxviii. 9. Is. i. 15. Jer. xi. 11. & xiv. 12. Ezek. viii. 18. Mic. iii. 4. Zech. vii. 13.

[t] ver. 16.

[u] ver. 2.

|| Or, *excommunicated him*, ver. 22.

[the] marvellous," &c. The man answers boldly, as if he had a firm faith in Him Who had opened his eyes. "Why, here is the marvellous thing that ye cannot read the significance of such a sign as opening the blind eyes, ye who, from your assuming to lead the Israel of God, are bound to distinguish between the false miracles and the true." Can we hope that the man recollected that one of the signs of the Messiah was to open the blind eyes? (Isaiah xlii. 7.)

31. "Now we know that God heareth not sinners." Sinners here, of course, are not those tainted with original sin, as all are, but determined, wilful sinners. "If I regard iniquity in mine heart, the Lord will not hear me." (Ps. lxvi. 18.) Much more does this apply to a power to perform a miracle as a proof of a mission from God.

33. "If this man were not of God, he could do nothing." Nothing, that is, sufficient to attest that He came from God.

34. "They answered . . . Thou wast altogether born in sins," &c. In saying this they reproach the man with his having been born blind, as showing, as they thought, that either he, in some former state, or his parents, had sinned so grievously as to entail such a calamity upon him.

"They cast him out." That is, they excommunicated him. Some think that it only signifies that they violently expelled him from the assembly or court. But from the fact that because they had thus cast him out, the Lord sought him in order to fix and confirm his faith in Himself, it seems as if He desired to make the outcast a

35 Jesus heard that they had cast him out; and when he had found him, he said unto him, Dost thou believe on [x] the Son of God?

[x] Matt. xiv. 33. & xvi. 16. Mark i. 1. ch. x. 36. 1 John v. 13.

---

35. "Son of God," read by A., L., later Uncials, all Cursives, even those which usually follow B., old Latin, Vulg., Syriac. "Son of Man," by ℵ, B., D.

partaker of a better fellowship than that of the Judaism from which he had been excluded.

35. "Jesus heard . . . . Dost thou believe on the Son of God?" The MSS. of the so-called Neutral Text against all other authority read Son of Man. If this be the true reading, it, of course, means, "Dost thou believe in the Son of Man as the Messiah?" (Daniel vii. 13.) To believe *in* a person is to believe in him as being something to us, as Lord, Saviour, Judge, Redeemer, Intercessor. A leading commentator seems to think that the Lord here sets before this man something beyond the common belief in the Messiah. He paraphrases the Lord's words by "cast thyself with complete trust on Him Who gathers up in Himself, Who bears and Who transfigures all that pertains to man;" but is it possible to believe that the Lord sets before this poor mendicant ideas of this sort? If by this is meant that Jesus by the term "Son of Man," sets Himself before him as one who is able to be the Second Adam, the New Head of the race, then He reveals to him, under a term commonly used in Syriac to express simply "man" or "human being," a very deep truth which He had, as yet, not revealed to the Apostles. The relation of Jesus Christ to the whole race, and to each individual of that race, is a conception which, though instrumentally connected with His Manhood, wholly depends on the Godhead dwelling in that Manhood for its realization. Luthardt says: "The answer of the healed man shows that Jesus must have asked with a conception that was familiar to him. That, however, was not Son of Man in the sense of Second Adam, but far more probably Son of God." Godet also pertinently remarks: "The reading 'Son of God' is undoubtedly to be preferred to that of three ancient Alex. MSS. ('Son of Man'), for it alone explains the act of worship with which the scene terminates." In no other place is belief in our Lord as simply the Son of Man insisted on, but in John iii. 18, belief in the name of the Son of God is the one thing needful. So in Peter's

36 He answered and said, Who is he, Lord, that I might believe on him?

37 And Jesus said unto him, Thou hast both seen him,
y ch. iv. 26. and [y] it is he that talketh with thee.

38 And he said, Lord, I believe. And he worshipped him.

z ch. v. 22, 27. See ch. iii. 17. & xii. 47.
a Matt. xiii. 13.

39 ¶ And Jesus said, [z] For judgment I am come into this world, [a] that they which see not might see; and that they which see might be made blind.

---

37. "It is he that talketh with thee;" rather more emphatically, "He that talketh with thee is he" (Alford); *qui loquitur tecum, ipse est* (Vulg.).

confession in Matth. xvi. 16. May we not connect our Lord's seeking and saving this outcast of Israel with His words in the next chapter respecting the Shepherd and the Door of the sheep?

36. "He answered and said, Who is he, Lord, that I might," &c. No doubt he knew the face and voice of Jesus, as he had returned from the pool of Siloam to Him. [He went his way and washed and came seeing, *i.e.* came back to Jesus.] But he thought of Him as yet only as a prophet, or one sent from God. He is the example of one who is ready to believe, but wants to know the object of faith. He had witnessed a good confession before his questioners, that His Benefactor was "a prophet," and was "of God:" now he has Him again before him, and he hears from His lips the words

37. "Thou hast both seen him, and it is he that talketh with thee." The words "Thou hast seen him," would remind him, very emphatically, that Jesus had bestowed upon him the power of seeing. Compare the words to the woman of Samaria, "I that speak unto thee am he."

38. "And he said, Lord, I believe, And he worshipped him." Acknowledging Him to be not only the Son of Man, which thing he before believed, but now the Son of God, in some very high sense of the words, he said, "Lord, I believe. "It is a small matter to say, "I believe;" wouldst thou see what manner of Person he believeth? Falling down, he worshipped Him." It is to be remarked that in Matth. xiv. 33, the confession of Jesus as the Son of God, is, as here, accompanied by worship.

39. "And Jesus said, For judgment, I am come into this world.

40 And *some* of the Pharisees which were with him heard these words, [b] and said unto him, Are we blind also? [b] Rom. ii. 19.

---

that," &c. Our Lord now solemnly reflects upon, and gathers up into a focus, the teaching of the foregoing miracle, and its attendant circumstances. He makes the man blind from his birth a type of the spiritually blind, but who are conscious of their blindness, and submit to be washed in Him. He makes the Jews, who thought they saw everything clearly, and who judged according to their pride of knowledge, a type of those who, from their self-sufficiency, reject His illumination; and who are, consequently, made totally blind, the very light within them, *i.e.*, their supposed knowledge of the Law, being turned into darkness.

"And Jesus said, For judgment I am come." This expresses, of course, not the purpose of Christ's coming into the world, but its necessary result. As holy Simeon had said, "He was for the fall and rising again of many in Israel." His words, being the words of God, tried men whether they were "of God." Even His highest, His most Divine and Supernatural claims attracted, as we have seen, those who felt that the state of their case, being desperate, needed not human, but Divine Help.

"That they which see not might see, and that they which see might," &c. "We are spiritually by nature born blind, and to know and confess this our blindness is *our* first and sole seeing; out of this the grace of the Lord can bring a full restoration to sight. . . . The being made blind, however, as happening to those who are essentially blind already, is partly an ironical expression for remaining blind, and partly points to the further truth that unbelief tends to increasing blindness and hardening." (Stier.)

40. "And some of the Pharisees which were with him." Being with Him cannot possibly mean "with him as his disciples," in any sense. It simply means those who were standing by. It has been said that these Pharisees still followed, under the guise of disciples, but clung to their own views of Messiah's work. But there is no proof that there were any such following our Lord. If there were such, it was the Apostles themselves, who till after Pentecost certainly took their own views of Messiah's work. (Matth. xvi. 22; xx. 20; Luke xxii. 24; xxiv. 21; Acts i. 6.)

41. "Jesus said unto them, If ye were blind," &c. This probably

41 Jesus said unto them, [c] If ye were blind, ye should
[c] ch. xv. 22, 24. have no sin: but now ye say, We see; therefore
your sin remaineth.

41. "Therefore your sin." "Therefore" omitted by ℵ, B., D., L., 1, 33, 69, 157, old Latin, Sah., Vulg.; retained by A., all later Uncials, Cursives, and Syriacs.

means, "If ye were totally without knowledge of the Law, ye would have no sin. It would not be imputed to you." ("Sin is not imputed where there is no law." Rom. iv. 15, and v. 13.)

"But now ye say, We see." "By the use of these very words ye acknowledge your consciousness of the difference between moral and spiritual light and darkness, therefore ye cannot plead want of knowledge, and therefore your sin remaineth, because ye do not allow this knowledge to bring you to Me to be enlightened by Me, and so your sin remaineth, according to My words, 'If ye believe not that I am *He*, ye shall die in your sins.'"

St. Augustine, however, gives a different turn to this saying of Christ: "If ye were blind, that is, if ye perceived that ye were blind, if ye owned yourselves to be blind, and ran to the Physician: if then ye were thus blind, you should not have sin, because I am come to take away sin. But now ye say, We see, your sin remaineth. Wherefore? Because by saying 'We see,' ye seek not the Physician. Ye remain in your blindness."

CHAP. X.

VERILY, verily, I say unto you, He that entereth not

The discourse in this chapter naturally springs out of the tyrannical conduct of the Jews or Pharisees, in having excommunicated the man to whom our Lord had restored sight. They cut him off from the fellowship of Israel; on hearing of which, our Lord, as the Good Shepherd, seeks him out and sets before him faith in Himself as the Door into a far better fellowship, that of the true flock of Christ.

by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber.

In doing this our Lord sets Himself forth as the One Door of access into the New Fold, and as the true Shepherd of the New Flock. The discourse in which He does this has the same character as all those which are preserved to the Church by St. John. It is the utterance of the "Word made Flesh"—of "God manifest in the Flesh." For the Lord, by calling Himself the Shepherd of the Flock or Church of God, claims to be that to the better and spiritual Israel which the Jehovah of the Old Testament had been to the carnal Israel. God had, by His prophet, taught Israel of old to say of Him, "He is the Lord our God, and we are the people of his pasture, and the sheep of his hand." "We are his people, and the sheep of his pasture." And not only was God the Shepherd of the whole flock, but by the mouth of David He had taught them to regard Him as the distinguishing and discerning Shepherd of each individual sheep. "The Lord is my shepherd, therefore can I lack nothing. He shall feed me in a green pasture, and lead me forth beside the waters of comfort." That God should stand to each soul amongst so many millions, in the relation of its Shepherd, can only be in virtue of His Omnipotence, which can control all events for its good; of His Omniscience, which knows all its most secret wants; and of His Omnipresence, which makes Him ever by its side to lead it and defend it.

So that the Lord Jesus here, in calling Himself the Shepherd of the New Flock, claims as His own those incommunicable attributes of God which are necessary for the successful leading and watching over a flock, not of sheep, but of human souls, and by claiming to be the Shepherd of the new and better flock which was to take the place of the old, and which was to gather into itself of all people, nations, and tongues, He sets Himself forth as acting in the place of God, on behalf of the people of God, as if He were God, and so claiming their trust, their obedience, their allegiance.

The discourse (1 to 18) consists of three divisions. In the first (1 to 6), which takes the form of allegory, the Lord appears as the door by which the true shepherds approach the flock. In the second, as the door by which all the flock—shepherds and sheep alike—enter into the fold; and in the third (11 to 18), as the Good Shepherd, Who gives His Life for, and Who knows the sheep.

2 But he that entereth in by the door is the shepherd of the sheep.

---

2. "The shepherd." "A shepherd," without article.

In the first five verses He sets forth an allegory, or, as the word is translated in verse 6, a parable, founded on the daily work of every shepherd of Palestine. The flocks at night were gathered into folds or enclosures surrounded by walls, and having one door, which was opened and shut by a porter or doorkeeper, who only admitted those who had flocks in the fold. More than one flock was often gathered for the night into one fold. In the morning, when it was time to lead out the flocks to pasture, each shepherd would come to the door, and the doorkeeper would immediately recognize him, and open to him: so that, if anyone entered in any other way, as by climbing over the wall, it was a sign that he had no right of entrance, and had come for some bad purpose.

When any shepherd to whom one of the flocks belonged came to collect and lead out his sheep, he called aloud, and all the sheep heard, but the sheep of the particular flock of which he is the shepherd recognize his voice as that of their shepherd. He has given names to them, and they hear their names called, and flock to him, and so he leads them out to pasture, and when he puts forth out of the gate his own sheep, *i.e.*, not necessarily the sheep of which he is the owner, but the sheep of which he is the shepherd, he goeth before them, and they follow him, because they know his voice: "And a stranger will they not follow, but will flee from him, for they know not the voice of strangers." Godet mentions a traveller who, meeting a shepherd bringing home his flock, changed garments with him, and thus disguised proceeded to call the sheep. They, however, remained motionless. The true shepherd then raised his voice, when they all hastened towards him, notwithstanding his strange garments. It is to be remembered that "the" shepherd of verse 2 should properly be rendered, a shepherd, and so does not refer primarily to the Lord, but represents the conduct of any real shepherd of the flock of God, whether before or after the time of Christ.

The Son of God was from the first the one Door into the fold of God's grace, whatever that fold was. He, by virtue of His being the Angel of the Covenant, Whose own were the people of Israel (ch. i. 11), was the Divine Person Who sent all the faithful prophets, leaders, and

3 To him the porter openeth; and the sheep hear his voice: and he calleth his own sheep by name, and leadeth them out.

---

teachers of Israel, who either bare messages from Him, or spake of Him, or prepared the way for Him. If any came, and were not sent by Him, they scattered the flock, instead of gathering it. It was through false teachers who came not through Him that the people were spoiled, and led into captivity in the earlier times, and in the later præ-Messianic times were "robbed" of the true meaning of their law, and of the true hope of the Messiah. One prophecy in Jeremiah, in particular (ch. xxiii.), sets forth the difference between those who had a true commission from the Lord and those who had not. "Woe be unto the pastors that destroy and scatter the sheep of my pasture!" "I have seen also in the prophets of Jerusalem an horrible thing: they commit adultery and walk in lies; they strengthen also the hands of evildoers, that none doth return from his wickedness: they are all of them unto me as Sodom." "I have not sent these prophets, yet they ran: I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied" (ch. xxiii. 1, 14, 21). It is remarkable that the very accusation brought by our Lord against those who came not through Him of being "thieves" is here urged by the prophet against these false prophets: "Behold, I am against the prophets, saith the Lord, that steal my word; every one from his neighbour" (v. 30). In the midst of these denunciations of the false prophets are promises that God would send faithful ones. "I will set shepherds over them which shall feed them" (v. 4). And this in close connection with the promise of the Messiah Himself, as "the righteous branch raised up to David, reigning and prospering, executing judgment and justice."

3. "To him the porter openeth." There can be little doubt but that by the "porter" or "doorkeeper" here is meant the Holy Spirit, Who opens a way for the true Shepherd to the hearts of the people, both in the Old and New Dispensations. This was especially fulfilled at the day of Pentecost. Then he who had himself entered in by the door, and, notwithstanding his grievous fall, was by the Searcher of Hearts thought worthy to receive the commission, "feed my sheep"—he approached the door, and it was opened by the Spirit, and three thousand of the true sheep recognized in his voice that of the One Shepherd.

4 And when he putteth forth his own sheep, he goeth before them, and the sheep follow him: for they know his voice.

4. "He putteth." "He hath put forth." Vulg., *emiserit.*

"His own sheep." For "sheep" MSS. following Neutral Text (Nca, B., D., L., 1, 22, 33, some old Latin, and some versions) read "all;" but A., most later Uncials, all Cursives except three, Vulg. and Syriac, read as in Text. Rec.

"He calleth his own sheep by name." Can this be said of any but the One Shepherd? No doubt it can, and somewhat in this way. The Jewish shepherd, when he entered into the fold in which were many flocks, by calling them by name, called to him those who were in a sense his own, but properly belonged to his master; so the true under-pastor, by preaching the Gospel, calls to him the true sheep, and they come, as if called by name. We must remember that, in the great spiritual fold, the actual name of the sheep is not pronounced as in the earthly fold; but it means that the Divine call is not general, but particular and individual, and is heard and obeyed by all who are "of God," as effectually as if the name itself were pronounced.

3, 4. "And leadeth them out. And when he putteth forth his own sheep, he goeth before them." The meaning of this "leading out" and "putting forth" has been strangely perverted by many expositors, especially Germans. It is understood as if the shepherd (whoever he be, whether the under shepherd or the Great Shepherd) leads the true flock out of the fold of Judaism into the free pastures of Christianity, in which it is supposed to be doubtful whether there is any fold—the restraint of the fold being supposed to be contrasted with the absolute freedom out of it; but nothing can be more contrary to historical truth. Neither Christ nor His Apostles ever led the Christian Jews—the converts to Christ in Jerusalem or Palestine—out of the Jewish fold, so long as that fold was in existence. By the destruction of the temple and dispersion of the nation, God absolutely destroyed the Jewish fold, rendering its polity and worship not unlawful, but impossible; but till then—that is, during a period of about forty years—the converted Israelites remained outwardly in the Old Fold. Notwithstanding persecution and excommunication and forced exclusion by the unbelieving Jews, there was no "going out" of the Jewish society, no disruption, nor anything approaching to it. The very man who was raised up to pro-

5 And a stranger will they not follow, but will flee from

---

claim the immunity of the Gentile believers from the yoke of the law, conformed to that law to the end of his life, so far as we have any account of it in Scripture. Some of his last recorded words were: "Men and brethren, though I have committed nothing against the people or customs of our fathers, yet was I delivered prisoner from Jerusalem into the hands of the Romans." (Acts xxviii. 17.)

In nothing is the power and goodness of the Great Shepherd more manifest than in His leading those who were still under the outward bondage of strict Judaism to such freedom from sin, and such joy and peace in believing as there was in the Pentecostal Church.

This "leading them out" is, of course, leading them to pasture; and it follows upon "calling them by name," for this necessary reason, that only when he led them out would each shepherd have to call his own flock out of the rest of the flocks folded together. When he led them back into the fold, which he must do at night, he would not have to call his own out of other flocks, as the flocks would pasture at some distance from one another; but when eventide came, they would naturally follow him home.

The "leading them out" and the "going before them" can only mean one thing—setting them an example of godly life. "Be ye followers of me as I am of Christ," says St. Paul. The pastor must go before the flock. The pastor must lead them in faith, in hope, in good works. And if he does thus lead them by setting forth the true faith, the lively hope, the abundant works, they follow him, for they know Whose voice his really is. (2 Cor. xiii. 3; Matt. x. 20.)

5. "And a stranger will they not follow," &c. Who are the strangers here, but strangers to God and Christ, who for some unworthy end intrude themselves into the ministry? Such, however popular they may be, even if they draw multitudes after them, feed not the true sheep.

This parable, or rather allegory, is quite distinct from the application of it which follows. It seems to refer wholly to shepherds—to any true shepherd who enters in through Christ the Door. One who is not a true shepherd enters not through the Door, but climbs up some other way, through the way of mere human scholarship or private influence. In the Lord's application of it in verses 7-11 He seems to put quite into the background the idea that

him: for they know not the voice of strangers.

He is the Door by which the under-shepherd enters, and sets Himself forth as the One Door of the whole flock, shepherds and sheep alike.

Before, however, proceeding to the application, or rather extension of the meaning of the parable in the following verses, it will be necessary to consider one matter of supreme importance, and this is the necessary connection which our Lord seems to lay down between "entering through the Door" and being "heard" and "followed" by the sheep. There can be no doubt that the shepherd enters through the Door by a personal faith in Christ, a personal individual coming to Him, or to God through Him, a personal dependence upon Him, and inherence in Him. And such, and such only, can speak so that the sheep hear them, and recognize in their voice the voice of Christ.

Let the reader remember that this personal faith and knowledge is quite apart from, and independent of, parties, schools of thought, denominations, Churches Eastern or Western, Churches national, or Churches as congregations. Multitudes of Romanist pastors thus speak from what they have learnt by personal faith in Christ. It is strictly in accord with the holding of the highest Church or Sacramental Doctrine which can be taught in the Church of England; witness the writings and sermons of such saints as Keble and Pusey. And, on the other hand, persons who range themselves under parties and sects whose very watchwords are such things as Conversion and Justification may not deliver the message or speak with the accents of the One Shepherd.

Another lesson from the parable demands notice. In this allegory or similitude the sheep are never supposed to go out or come in of themselves, but only when led out or in by the shepherd. They only go to pasture when the shepherd comes in at the door to call them. So that in this parable, the Lord, whilst laying down the absolute necessity of entering in by a personal faith in Himself as the Door, never contemplates the sheep as acting without the pastor; in other words, He never contemplates the Church as existing without a ministry. So that the place which, above all others, teaches that none can be a true pastor without personal faith in the Son of God, teaches also that ministerial action and intervention is of the essence of the Church. I am not speaking now of Church

6 This parable spake Jesus unto them: but they understood not what things they were which he spake unto them.

---

6. "This parable;" rather, perhaps, "allegorical saying" (*paroimia*). Same word as is used in John xvi. 29 in contrast with plain or open speech. Vulg., *hoc proverbium.*

government, but of the ministry in the most extended sense of the word.

And yet it is clear that the Lord has not here in view the external ordination so much as the inward call. There must be the valid ordination if the Church is not to be a mere congeries of sects, and for the same reason that ordination must be Episcopal; but this the Lord appears here not so much to have in mind as the fitness for the ministry which springs from realizing faith in His Person and work. Let the reader note the following passage from so decided a Catholic as the late Isaac Williams, "No self-confident deacon; no ambitious, or covetous, or ease-loving priest; no proud prelate; none of these, though in right lineal descent from the Twelve or the Seventy, enter the sheepfold by Christ, the Door."

This allegory or similitude, then, sets forth Christ as the Door by which all shepherds approach the flock.

Now he proceeds to speak of Himself as the Door of the flock itself, ministers and people alike being His sheep, who must enter His fold through Himself.

6, 7. "This parable spake . . . I am the door of the sheep." Why did they not understand this parable? Was it because their conduct to the man to whom Jesus had restored sight, showed that the character of a true shepherd of souls was utterly alien from theirs, or because they did not receive the Divine claims of Jesus to be to the true Israel of God what Jehovah of old had been to the carnal Israel? If they had had the spirit of true pastorship, God might have helped them to discern the high claims of the true Pastor.

"I am the Door of the sheep." I am the one entrance into the house, into the grace, into the kingdom of God. "No man cometh unto the Father but by Me." (John xiv. 7.) How do men enter through Christ as the Door? Some say in Baptism, by which men are grafted into the mystical body. Some say in Conversion only, when a man consciously approaches God through Christ. But must not the two be taken together? No unbaptized man can enter into the fold or be numbered among the

7 Then said Jesus unto them again, Verily, verily, I say unto you, I am the door of the sheep.

8 All that ever came before me are thieves and robbers: but the sheep did not hear them.

---

8. "Before me" omitted by ℵ, E., F., G., M., some Cursives, old Latin, Vulg., and Peshito; but retained in A., B., D., L., most Cursives, and older versions.

flock unless he submit to receive this mark or seal which the Saviour so emphatically declares to be the entrance into His kingdom. If he does not, he despises the word and the promise of Christ given in that Sacrament, and cannot be said to come through Him. And if a man after being baptized lives contrary to the faith and obedience of Christ, he is a lost sheep, and requires to be brought again through Christ into the flock by true conversion or repentance unto life.

But it must be ever remembered that when our Lord speaks of thus passing through Himself as the Door, He does not speak of one act of either Baptism or Conversion, but of a life-long habit, as we shall presently see.

8. "All that [ever] came before me are thieves and robbers," &c. This cannot but refer to the succession of teachers who increasingly corrupted the Word of God from the time of the latest prophets to the time of Christ. During the whole of this period there appears to have been, under the evil influence of the scribes, an ever-increasing perversion of the meaning of the Word of God. The Lord seems to have in His mind the 34th of Ezekiel, where the prophet teaches that before God Himself comes down in the person of the Spiritual David to take the oversight of His flock more directly into His own hands, there would be evil teachers whom the prophet describes as oppressors and robbers. "Woe be to the shepherds of Israel that do feed themselves! Ye eat the fat, and ye clothe yourselves with the wool, ye kill them that are fed . . . . with force and with violence have ye ruled them." And this state of things is terminated by God coming to His flock as its true Shepherd, delivering them from the evil and covetous shepherds, whose teaching is described in terms which exactly answer to that of the Scribes and Pharisees: "Seemeth it a small thing to you to have eaten up the good pasture, but ye must tread down with your feet the residue of your pasture; and to have drunk of the deep waters, but ye must foul the residue with your feet?" (v. 18.) This

9 [a] I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture.

[a] ch. xiv. 6. Eph. ii. 18.

---

evil state of things seems to have gone on progressing for two or three centuries before the time of our Lord, and to have reached its climax when He came, so that we must take the words "before Me," as naturally we should, as meaning, for some time "before Me." No one before John the Baptist seems to have been raised up to protest against the corruption in the teaching of the flock of God; when he came he denounced the false teachers as a generation of vipers.

Some have attempted to find the key to the meaning of this verse in the word "came," as meaning those who came in contrast to Him, of Whom it is emphatically said that He should come—who "came" to satisfy national expectations, &c., but all this seems far-fetched and unlikely. The two or three false Christs, such as Judas and Theudas could scarcely be meant by "all that came before me."

"The sheep did not hear them." There was always a remnant of the true people of God, who would not listen to the false interpretations by which it was robbed of its meaning; just as in the times of idolatry there were the seven thousand who had not bowed the knee to Baal.

9. "I am the door: by me if any man enter in," &c. Not merely any shepherd, but if any one enter in, he shall be saved. He shall be in a state of salvation here, free from the dominion of sin, and having power to serve God in holiness and righteousness, and if he continue in Me to the end (John xv. 4), shall be saved everlastingly.

"And shall go in and out." This is a familiar Old Testament expression for leading our daily life in the sight of others. Thus 1 Samuel xviii. 16, "But all Israel and Judah loved David, because he went out and came in before them." Also, "The Lord preserve thy going out and thy coming in from this time forth for evermore." (Ps. cxxi. 8.) It means that not only the inner spiritual, but the daily outer life and conversation shall be "in Christ."

"Shall find pasture." He shall feed on Christ in the Scriptures, and in the Eucharist, and shall find in them food to nourish him unto Life Eternal.

10 The thief cometh not, but for to steal, and to kill, and to destroy: I am come that they might have life, and that they might have *it* more abundantly.

11 [b] I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep.

[b] Is. xl. 11. Ezek. xxxiv. 12, 23. & xxxvii. 24. Heb. xiii. 20. 1 Pet. ii. 25. & v. 4.

---

10. "More" omitted by Revisers and Alford, but Vulg. *abundantius; id quod præstans est, habeant* (Syriac).

11. "Giveth." "Layeth down" is a more correct translation of the original, which is the same as is rendered "lay down" in verses 16 and 17.

10. "The thief cometh not, but for to steal," &c. Hitherto the Lord had compared false shepherds with true, the false being thieves and robbers; now He uses the singular number, and speaks of the thief. Must not He here allude to him who sends and inspires and is the father of all those who rend and devour the flock, and tread down their pasture and foul the pure water; just as, in verse 12, He calls him the wolf?

"I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it [more] abundantly," or "in abundance." The Son of God has come that men who believe in Him may have not only some measure of life, but no stinted measure. We read that God hath shed the Spirit on His Church *abundantly*. (Titus iii. 6.) This abundant life is manifest in the abundant good works of St. Paul, and other Apostles, and in the lives of eminent Saints and Missionaries in all ages of the Church. When the Pentecostal Church continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine, in their fellowship, in the breaking of bread, in the prayers, in the fear of God, in charity and generosity; so that they sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all, "when they continued daily in the temple, and eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God;" then they manifested the *abundance* of the Life which Christ had bestowed.

11. "I am the good shepherd." In the Greek language the idea of beauty is associated with goodness in the word good [καλος,] here. It was used by the Greeks to designate goodness as the highest moral beauty.

"The Truth has said of Himself, 'I am the good shepherd.' All love, care, providence, devotion, watchfulness, that is in earth or in

12 But he that is an hireling, and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and

---

heaven, in the ministry of men or of angels, is but a reflection or participation of that which is in Him. Surely nothing but the vision of His presence in heaven can exceed this revelation of Himself. These words have taken so deep a hold of the hearts of His people, that from the beginning they passed into a common title for their exalted Head. It was the symbol under which, in times of persecution, His Presence was shadowed forth. It was sculptured on the walls of sepulchres and catacombs, it was painted in upper chambers and in oratories, it was traced upon their sacred books, it was graven on the vessels of the altar. The image of the Good Shepherd has expressed, as in a parable, all their deepest affections, fondest musings, most docile obedience, most devoted trust. It is a title in which all other titles meet, in the light of which they blend and lose themselves: Priest, Prophet, King, Saviour, and Guide are all summed up in this one more than royal, paternal, saving Name. It recalls in one word all the mercies and loving-kindness of God to His people of old, when the Shepherd of Israel made His own people 'to go forth like sheep, and guided them in the wilderness like a flock.'" (Manning.)

"The good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep." The primary idea is, of course, in defence of the sheep. A good shepherd, David, risked his life on behalf of his father's flock when he slew the lion and the bear, but the Good Shepherd could not give His Life after that fashion. The power of Evil could not be overcome by force and adroitness, but by submission to death in the way of atonement. And so the Son of God laid down His life for the sheep as a ransom for them, and so the flock is His own, purchased with His own Blood. (Acts xx. 28.)

"But he that is an hireling, and not [the] shepherd, whose own the sheep are not." There are great differences of opinion respecting who is meant by the "hireling" here. Godet considers that the Lord means the leaders of the Jews who believed on Him, but through fear of men did not confess Him; and so through their cowardice He was delivered to death. Others make the hireling and the thief or robber to be the same; but this seems impossible. The meaning must be general, and must signify all who take the oversight of souls for the sake of gain rather than of Christ. Thus, Augustine:

[c] Zech. xi. 16, 17. [c]leaveth the sheep, and fleeth: and the wolf catcheth them, and scattereth the sheep.

12. "Scattereth the sheep." "The sheep" omitted by ℵ, B., D., L., and a few Cursives; retained by A., later Uncials, most Cursives, Vulg., old Latin, Syriac.

"Who then is the hireling? There are in the Church certain overseers, of whom the Apostle Paul saith, 'Seeking their own, not the things of Christ.' What meaneth seeking their own? Not loving Christ freely, not seeking God for His own sake; men pursuing temporal advantages, men open-mouthed for gain, seeking honours of men." And yet the same divine clearly distinguishes them from thieves and robbers: "Many in the Church, pursuing earthly advantages, do yet preach Christ, and through them the voice of Christ is heard: and the sheep follow, not the hireling, but the voice of the Shepherd through the hireling."

"Seeth the wolf coming," *i.e.* the enemy of souls in any of his manifold disguises, as not only persecution, but heresy, worldly living, or a low standard of faith and morals.

"Leaveth the sheep, and fleeth: and the wolf catcheth them and scattereth [them]." How can the hireling be blamed for fleeing, seeing that the Lord says, even to the Apostles, "When they persecute you in one city, flee ye to another?" Augustine explains this by the man through fear of men neglecting his duty. His comment is very searching: "Who is the hireling that seeth the wolf coming, and fleeth? The man who seeks his own, not the things which are Jesus Christ's, that man does not frankly reprove him that sinneth. Lo some man hath sinned, hath grievously sinned: he must be rebuked, be excommunicated: yea, but excommunicated he will be an enemy, will plot, will do a mischief when he can. Now the man who seeks his own, not the things which are Jesus Christ's, this man, that he may not lose that which he follows after, to wit, the advantage of men's friendship, and incur the annoyance of men's enmity, holds his peace, does not rebuke. Lo the wolf is griping the sheep by the throat: the devil hath seduced a believer into adultery; thou holdest thy peace, rebukest not. O hireling, thou sawest the wolf coming and fleddest! Perchance he answer, 'Lo here I am: I have not fled.' Thou hast fled, because thou hast held thy peace."

"Scattereth the sheep." Let the reader notice what an evil the

13 The hireling fleeth, because he is an hireling, and careth not for the sheep.

14 I am the good shepherd, and [d] know my *sheep,* and am known of mine.

[a] 2 Tim. ii. 19.

---

13. "The hireling fleeth." So A^2, (original reading doubtful), X., Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, later Uncials, most Cursives, nearly all old Latin, Vulg., Syriacs, Goth.; but ℵ, B., D., L., 1, 22, 33, Sah., Coptic, Arm. Æth., omit "the hireling fleeth."

14. "And am known of mine." ℵ, B., D., L., Vulg., old Latin, and some versions read, "And mine know Me;" but A., the later Uncials, most Cursives, Syriac, and some versions read as in Text. Recept.

scattering of the sheep is in the eyes of the Lord. And must He not have esteemed the unity of His flock as beyond all things needful for the spread of the Gospel when He prayed so earnestly that "they all may be one, as thou, O Father, art in Me and I in Thee, that they may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me"? (xvii. 21).

"The hireling fleeth, because he is an hireling, and careth not for the sheep." That is the man who has an hireling spirit, and takes the oversight, not for the work, but for the wages. "It is not the bare receiving hire which denominates a man a hireling (for the labourer is worthy of his hire, and the Lord hath ordained that they who preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel). But the loving hire, the loving the hire more than the work, the working for the sake of the hire. He is an hireling who would not work were it not for the hire. What is he then that continually takes the hire, and yet does not work at all?" (Wesley.)

14. "I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep." As in verse 11 He calls Himself the Good Shepherd because He lays down His Life for the sheep, so here He calls Himself the Good Shepherd because He knows His sheep, and is known of them.

It is, next to His laying down His life for the sheep, the great proof of His goodness that He knows His sheep, not as a whole, not as a flock merely, but each one: each soul is precious in His sight, and so He knows the wants of each one. His is not a general superintendence of a vast flock, but a loving and distinguishing regard for each sheep of the flock. "He knows us through and through, all that we have been and are, all that we desire and need, hope and fear, do, and leave undone, all our thoughts, affections, purposes, all our secret acts, all our hidden life." It is needful that He should have all this consciously in His knowledge, for His

• Matt. xi. 27. 15 • As the Father knoweth me, even so know I

15. "Even so know I;" rather, "and I know." *Sicut novit me Pater et Ego agnosco Patrem* (Vulg.).

pastorate is not that of a flock only, but of each particular sheep in the flock. In a way far above all human thought, He saves, He leads, He restores, He pastures each soul by itself as if it were the only one in the flock.

"And am known of mine." His true sheep do not merely know about Him, about His Incarnation, His Life, Works, Teaching, Sufferings, Death, but they know Him as one person knows another. He has called them by name, and they have answered to the call. They have had some tokens, perhaps many, that He recognizes them one by one. They have had some personal experience of His love, compassion, gentleness, or wise and merciful correction. So their knowledge is personal. "It is the knowledge of heart with heart, soul with soul, spirit with spirit: a sense of presence and companionship; so that when most alone we are perceptibly least alone; when most solitary we are least forsaken. It is a consciousness of guidance, help, and protection, so that all we do or say, and all that befalls us, is shared by Him. It fills us with a certainty that in every part of our lot, in all its details, there is some purpose, some indication of His design and will, some discipline or medicine for us; some hid treasure if we will purchase it; some secret of peace if we will make it our own."

15. "As the Father knoweth me, and I know the Father." And this knowledge is the image and reflection of the highest of all mutual knowledge, that of the Father and the Son. It is to be reverently remembered that the Lord, by taking our nature and coming amongst us, became of the flock of God His Father. Knowing perfectly the Father, and being known perfectly of the Father, He submitted to His Father's will and guidance, and put Himself under the care of His Father's providence, so that He knows His Father as His Shepherd, and the Father knows Him as the First of His Flock. And He communicates this knowledge to each true sheep, not, of course, to the same degree, for the knowledge of One Another possessed by the Persons of the Trinity is infinite, but it is of the same nature, the "as" signifying likeness, not equality. Our knowledge of Him is the same loving trustfulness and devotion to His Will as he has to His Father's Will. And He looks upon us with

the Father: [f]and I lay down my life for the sheep.

[f] ch. xv. 13.

16 And [g]other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my

[g] Is. lvi. 8.

---

the same guiding, fostering love as His Father, in His state of humiliation, looked upon Him.

There is a very deep truth in this, that the love divine and infinite which the Persons of the Trinity have to one another is the fountain of all pure love which holy creatures have to one another; and similarly the knowledge which the Divine Persons have of one another, is the origin and pattern of that knowledge by which holy creatures know one another.

"And I lay down my life for the sheep." This is not a mere repetition, but follows upon His declaration of His knowledge of the sheep. He knows them, He knows their needs, He knows their danger from the enemy, He knows too what capacities there are in them for serving God and returning His own and His Father's Love: and so because of this knowledge He lays down His Life for them, that His infinite grace may reach them and perfect them.

16. "Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring," &c. The "other sheep" are the Gentiles which were to believe in Him through the preaching of His word. Notice that even now they are His, though they know it not: "Other sheep I *have*."

"Which are not of this fold." By saying "not of *this* fold," does the Lord mean that there was a heathen fold or folds? Impossible: A fold is that into which sheep are gathered, and in which they are surrounded by outward and visible means of protection. No doubt Christ kept by His own power all those among the heathen whom He designed ultimately to hear His voice and become of His true flock, but He kept them by other means than those by which He kept the Jewish flock which He hedged round. (Isaiah v. 2.) "Them also I must bring," *i.e.*, into the true fold, or rather flock, by the preaching of the Gospel.

"They shall hear my voice." Just as the sheep of the first or old fold heard His voice in the voices of the true under-pastors, so these shall hear His voice in the words of such preachers as Paul and Timothy, and those who in succession after them preached the same Gospel.

voice; [h] and there shall be one fold, *and* one shepherd.

[h] Ezek. xxxvii. 22. Eph. ii. 14. 1 Pet. ii. 25.

17 Therefore doth my Father love me, [i] because I lay down my life, that I might take it again.

[i] Is. liii. 7, 8, 12. Heb. ii. 9.

18 No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down

---

16. "There shall be one fold;" rather, one "flock." The Authorized rendering is a mistranslation.

"There shall be one fold [or rather flock] and one shepherd." By saying that there is to be one flock our Lord means to assert that there shall be One Catholic Church, not one Jewish and one Gentile fold, but one Body of Christ, one organization for the preservation of the truth, and for the perfecting of the Saints. This was the Lord's intention; how far His intention has been frustrated by the wilfulness and perverseness of men we cannot now determine, suffice it to say that it is impossible that He could have contemplated an unlimited number of separate visible organizations, each founded on its own peculiar view of the truth.

17. "Therefore doth my Father love me." In addition to that infinite love wherewith the Father regards the Son in the Godhead, there is, if it may be lawful to say so, an additional Love on the part of the Father, because the Son hath devoted Himself to be the Eternal Mediator between God and His creatures. This Mediation was not to end with His Death, but continue eternally in and through that renewed Life which He "took again" on the third day. He died for our sakes that He might bring us to God, and He lives for our sakes that He may accomplish and perfect that "bringing us to God" and uniting us with God for the sake of which He died. "If Jesus in devoting Himself to death, had not done so with a determined purpose to rise again, He would have but half given Himself, His Death would have been a withdrawal at the same time that it was a gift." (Godet.)

18. "No man taketh it from me." This was proved in our Lord's very act of dying. Having cried with a loud voice, which showed that His natural strength was not exhausted, and so that He could not then die naturally, He surrendered His Life into the hands of God, in the words, "Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit." As Bengel says: "Jesus let Himself be taken by His enemies

of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I [k] have power to take it again. [l] This commandment have I received of my Father.

19 ¶ [m] There was a division therefore again among the Jews for these sayings.

[k] ch. ii. 19.
[l] ch. vi. 38. & xv. 10. Acts ii. 24, 32.
[m] ch. vii. 43 ix. 16

---

19. "Therefore" omitted in ℵ, B., L., 33, 49, old Latin, and Vulg., but retained in A., D., later Uncials, almost all Cursives, Coptic, Syriac (Pesh.)

of His own accord, and on the very Cross He sent forth His Spirit, not in any weakness, but with a shout."

It is to be noticed that in the original the first personal pronoun being expressed both here and in the last verse is very emphatic. It might be rendered in English by "I, even I, lay it down of myself," or, "I myself lay it down of myself." The surrender was as supernatural an act of His own power as was the resuming of it.

This does not mean, of course, that He was divinely protected till His time came, but when His time to die had come He surrendered His Life by an act of will. "I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." He has power, or right, because He has life in Himself, and because having no sin, original or actual, He could not, on His own account, pay the penalty of sin.

"This commandment have I received of my Father." This seems to be a solemn assertion that in the matter of dying and rising again, over which He had perfect power in Himself, He yet acted in accordance with the will of the Father, and did nothing without Him. The great redemptive act of dying and rising again was not an act of His own Thought and Will, as if He loved mankind more than the Father did, but it took place by the Will, and so by the ordination and direction of the Father. Though He has perfect power in Himself, He does nothing of Himself (viii. 28); all is in, by, and with, the Father.

19, 21. "There was a division therefore again among the Jews . . . open the eyes of the blind." Some of them would altogether misunderstand the words. They heard astonishing things, such as that He should be the Shepherd of the whole future flock of God, and they would see nothing in Him to warrant such pretensions, because they shut their eyes to all that enforced His claims; and so they pronounced Him a maniac under possession. Others remembered the opening of the eyes of the man born blind, and they felt that

20 And many of them said, [n] He hath a devil, and is mad; why hear ye him?

21 Others said, These are not the words of him that hath a devil. [o] Can a devil [p] open the eyes of the blind?

22 ¶ And it was at Jerusalem the feast of the dedication, and it was winter.

[n] ch. vii. 20, & viii. 48, 52.

[o] Ex. iv. 11. Ps. xciv. 9. & cxlvi. 8.

[p] ch. ix. 6, 7, 32, 33.

22. "And it was winter." "And" omitted by ℵ, B., D., G., L.; retained by A., E., F., K., M., old Latin, Vulg., and Syriac.

there was not only an authority, and a depth, and a Divine sweetness, but a marvellous coherence in His sayings ("These are not the words of him that hath a devil"), and they were arrested and were on the road to belief and acceptance. Again I ask the reader to notice how the assertion, on His own part, of the highest claims of Christ, to shepherd the flock of God in a way which can be true only of the Supreme Being, whilst, as was natural, it repelled many, still attracted many—no doubt all those who were "of God."

22. "And it was at Jerusalem the feast of the dedication." Probably it was then the Encænia in Jerusalem. The Encænia, or Feast of the Re-dedication of the Altar (not of the Temple), was instituted by Judas Maccabæus, to commemorate the Re-dedication of the Altar after it had been defiled by Antiochus Epiphanes. It is thus described:—"Now on the five-and-twentieth day of the ninth month, which is called the month Casleu, in the hundred forty and eighth year, they rose up betimes in the morning and offered sacrifice according to the law, on the new altar of burnt-offerings which they had made. Look at what time and what day the heathen had profaned it, even in that was it dedicated with songs, and citherns, and harps, and cymbals. Then all the people fell on their faces and worshipped, praising the God of heaven who had given them good success. And so they kept the dedication of the altar eight days." (1 Maccab. iv. 52-56.)

This was on the 25th Chisleu: and between it and the last mentioned feast, the feast of Tabernacles, there was an interval of two months, during which it is very probable that our Lord was teaching in Galilee and Peræa; and it is supposed that the incidents recorded in Luke xi.-xviii. 30, occurred during this period between the

23 And Jesus walked in the temple [q] in Solomon's porch.

24 Then came the Jews round about him, and said unto him, How long dost thou || make us to doubt? If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly.

25 Jesus answered them, I told you, and ye believed not:

[q] Acts iii. 11. & v. 12.

|| Or, *hold us in suspense?*

---

24. "How long dost thou make us to doubt?" *Quousque animam nostram tollis* (Vulg.), but see below.

two Festivals. The way in which the mention of Jerusalem in this verse is brought in would lead us to suppose that our Lord had returned to the city after some absence.

"It was winter. And Jesus walked in the temple in Solomon's porch." A covered cloister forming the Eastern boundary of the Temple. The two notices correspond to one another, because of the inclemency of the season the Lord walked and taught in this covered part.

24. "Then came the Jews round about him, and said unto him," &c. The Jews encircled Him. They closed Him in so that, apparently, He was by Himself in their midst, separated from His disciples. No doubt they did this that, by a kind of compulsion, they might force Him to answer their questions.

"How long dost thou make us to doubt?" Rather, as in margin, How long dost thou hold our minds in suspense? or it may be rendered, How long dost thou raise our minds? *i.e.*, with Messianic hopes which Thou art so slow in satisfying by decisive words and actions. "If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly."

25. "Jesus answered them, I told you, and ye believed not." When had our Lord told them that He was the Messiah? He had told them sometimes in words which they energetically rejected that He was far more than any Messiah such as they expected, for He had told them that whatsoever His Father did He did; that He would, in the place and by the authority of the Father, judge all men; that He was the Light of the world; that if they believed not on Him they would die in their sins; that His Father was always with Him; that children of Abraham though they called themselves, they were not free till He made them free; that if a man keep His saying He shall never see death; that before Abraham came into existence He *is*; that He was the door into God's fold; that He was the Shepherd of the sheep—the Good Shepherd, Who

[r] the works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me.

[r] ver. 38. ch. iii. 2. & v. 36.

[s] ch. viii. 47. 1 John iv. 6.

26 But [s] ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you.

[t] ver. 4, 14.

27 [t] My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me:

---

26. "As I said unto you" omitted by ℵ, B., K., L., M., some Cursives, Vulg., and some versions; retained by ℵ, D., some later Uncials, and old Latin (a, b, e, f), and Syriac.

knew His sheep, and had power not only to lay down His Life for them, but to take it again. He had told them all this, but in thus setting Himself before them He had been careful to assure them that in nothing whatsoever did He speak, or judge, or witness, or act apart from His Father. There was the most perfect oneness between them.

This was far more than telling them that He was the Christ. It was a conception of the Christ infinitely beyond, and so contrary to, their low, carnal expectations.

"The works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me." You have not my unsupported word, but works in number and power such as no man before Me has done. Their very adherents had said, "When Christ cometh, will He do more works than this man hath done?"

26. "But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep [as I said unto you]." If the words "as I said unto you" are genuine, then the Lord refers to viii. 47: "He that is of God heareth God's words; ye therefore hear them not because ye are not of God." The words may be taken with verse 27: "As I said unto you, my sheep hear my voice," &c.

27. "My sheep hear my voice." It is to be remembered that this important passage is a repetition of the leading ideas which the Lord had enunciated in the beginning of this chapter respecting His relations to His true sheep as their Shepherd.

"My sheep hear my voice" corresponds to "they know his voice;" "I know them" to "I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep;" "They follow me" to "The sheep follow him, for they know his voice;" "I give unto them Eternal Life" to "I am come that they may have life, and that they may have it more abundantly." "They shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my

28 And I give unto them eternal life; and [u] they shall never perish, neither shall any *man* pluck them out of my hand.

[u] ch. vi. 37. & xvii. 11, 12. & xviii. 9.

---

hand," corresponds to what He says respecting protecting His sheep and their "being saved," and their "going in and out and finding pasture."

Two questions must now be considered:—

1. Is our Lord here enunciating a perfectly general Theological truth, without any special reference to any particular followers of His, or has He in His mind certain persons? I believe if we compare the first words of the next verse, "My Father, which gave them me," with such words as those in the Great Intercession, "Thine they were, and thou gavest them me;" "I pray for them which thou hast given me;" "Those that thou gavest me I have kept,"—if these words, and many of a like kind, are taken into account, they prove that the Lord here primarily speaks of the Apostles. And there seems to be a necessity for it: for the Saviour was severely blaming the Jews for their unbelief and rejection of His words. But might they not retort, "Who could accept such words, implying such transcendent relations to God, such a place in the universe by His side, such power of doing all that the Father does?" The answer is, that there were amongst them those who had accepted His claims, there were those who, because they were of God, heard in His words the words of God—a small number, but sufficient for all God's purposes in the founding of His Church, and giving it its first direction.

2. "They shall never perish." These words have been used as implying the final perseverance of all who have been, for ever so short a time, sheep of Christ, and so many have so perverted them as to comfort themselves with the idea that having once experienced the internal workings of Divine grace they never can be finally cast away, no matter how they live; but in doing this they ignore the all-important clause "They follow me." No one can take the smallest comfort from this verse unless he is following in the footsteps of the goodness and righteousness of Christ. If he is in the least degree willingly turning aside, this promise does not belong to him. Besides this, the words "I know them," imply necessarily, "I know them with approval," just as in the first Psalm the Lord is

29 [x] My Father, [y] which gave *them* me, is greater than all; and no *man* is able to pluck *them* out of my Father's hand.

30 [z] I and *my* Father are one.

x ch. xiv. 28.
y ch. xvii. 2, 6, &c.
z ch. xvii. 11, 22.

---

29. "My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all." So ℵ, D., L., T., Δ, A, Π, later Uncials, all Cursives, Sah.; but A., B., X., all old Latin, Vulg., Goth., Coptic, read "a greater thing." "That which my Father giveth me is greater than all." *Pater meus quod dedit mihi, majus omnibus est* (Vulg.) but it seems inconceivable that our Lord, Who is here speaking of the dependence and obedience of the flock, should, without any apparent reason, bring in its greatness. The Syriac reads as in Authorized and Received Text, *Pater enim meus qui dedit eos mihi, omnibus major est.*

said to "know the way of the righteous," and as in the Sermon on the Mount the Lord represents Himself as saying to those whom He rejects, "Depart from me, I never knew you, all ye workers of iniquity."

29. "My Father which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able," &c. The power of the Father to keep the sheep is not here contrasted with the power of the Son, as if the Father's power were greater, but it is simply asserted that the Son is not alone, or by Himself, in His protection of the sheep. I take this place to be parallel to, and an echo of, those many passages which we have noticed in the previous discourses in which the Son asserts that He does nothing, judges no one, says nothing, teaches nothing, witnesses nothing, without, or apart from, the Father. As in all other instances of Divine Energy, so particularly in that of preserving the true sheep, they work together; so that "no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand," corresponds to "neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand." What is the lesson which the true sheep should learn from this? Not continually to boast of security, but unceasingly to commend themselves to God in such words as, "Into thy hands I commend my spirit, for thou hast redeemed me, O Lord, thou God of truth."

30. "I and my Father are one." This, no doubt, primarily means, One in the exercise of Almighty power in the protection of the sheep, and therefore One in the possession of what must be the substratum of that Almighty power, One in the Divine Substance. The Oneness of the Son with the Father in will, in action, in knowledge, in judgment, in the terms in which the Lord asserts this Oneness through-

31 Then [a] the Jews took up stones again to stone him.

32 Jesus answered them, Many good works have I shewed you from my Father: for which of those works do ye stone me?

33 The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, [b] makest thyself God.

[a] ch. viii. 59.

[b] ch. v. 18.

out this Gospel, can only arise from Oneness in Divine Essence, and cannot be even thought of apart from such Oneness of Essence: and so this is the most absolute assertion on the part of our Lord, of Oneness with His Father in the Trinity, which can be conceived.

31, 32, 33. "Then the Jews took up stones .... makest thyself God." "The Jews took up stones." Rather, "bare stones," as if they brought them from a distance; perhaps, however, owing to the repairs of the temple, loose stones were at hand.

32. "Jesus answered them, Many good works have I shewed you from my Father, &c." Here is wisdom akin to that which He had so often displayed in turning the words of His persecutors against themselves (Matthew xxii. 29-46). Instead of asking them "why they stoned Him?", He asked, "for what good works that I have shewed you from my Father do ye stone me?" He had not said what He had said respecting His Omnipotence with the Father without testimony from that Father. He threw them back upon such works as the healing of the man at the pool of Bethesda, the restoring sight to one born blind, and, doubtless, many others; and He disclaimed having done these things apart from His Father. On the contrary, He declares that He had showed them these works *from* His Father, repeating what He had said before, "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do," &c. (chap. v. 19, 20).

33. "For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy ... makest thyself God." It is clear that the Jews understood Him aright, as asserting equality with the Father. They interpreted His words in the only way consistent with common sense, as they had done before when He had said, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." He had then done a Divine work which none but either God Himself or one come with a commission from God could do, a work which could only be done by an interposition of the direct

34 Jesus answered them, [c] Is it not written in your law, I
[c] Ps. lxxxii. 6. said, Ye are gods?
[d] Rom. xiii. 1. 35 If he called them gods, [d] unto whom the
word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken;

---

power of God. Having done such a work, for Him to say in allusion to it, "My Father worketh, and I work," was to assert of Himself a power working side by side with, and in the same sphere as the Divine power: and now He had been asserting that the true sheep of God were His sheep: and as Jehovah had led and fed them of old, so He would in future pasture them, and particularly He had asserted their security, in that they were in His hands, and also in His Father's, and yet the protection was one, "I and my Father are one." There could be but one inference from this, which the Jews naturally and rightly understood to be a claim to equality with the Father in protecting the sheep of God, and if in that, in everything, for the Lord evidently assumes that the protection of souls in the spiritual world from their spiritual enemies is a distinctly Divine act.

34. "Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? If he called them gods . . . . the scripture cannot be broken." His argument is this: "You accuse me of blasphemy, not because I said in so many words, I am God, but because I said, I am the Son of God. Well, in your own Sacred Books the word "god" is given in a subordinate sense to those to whom God has given His Spirit and His power that they may judge the people of God in truth and equity. If they then can properly, and without blasphemy, be called gods, much more can I, Whom the Father set apart and consecrated to the office of Redeemer before He sent Me into the world, call Myself, without blasphemy, Son of God."

In order to see somewhat of the wisdom of this answer, it is to be remembered that the term "God" (Theos, Elohim) is not the incommunicable Name of the Supreme Being. That Name is Jehovah or Elyon, which could never be given except to Him Who manifested Himself to Moses in the bush. The term "God" signifies the powerful One or Ones, and so early as in the third chapter of Genesis it is given to those beings who were in power greater than men. "Ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." In

36 Say ye of him, [e] whom the Father hath sanctified, and [f] sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; [g] because I said, I am [h] the Son of God?

[e] ch. vi. 27.
[f] ch. iii. 17. & v. 36. 37. & viii. 42.
[g] ch. v. 17, 18. ver. 30.
[h] Luke i. 35. ch. ix. 35, 37.

36. "Sanctified." "Consecrated" in margin of Revised.
"The Son of God;" rather, "Son of God," without article.

this, and in 1 Sam. xxviii. 13 ("I see gods ascending out of the earth") it seems given to all supernatural beings, reserving, of course, its full application to the one Supreme Jehovah. In this sense it seems to be used in the first verse of the Psalm the Lord quotes, "He is a judge among gods." Subordinately to this it is given to judges, because God gave them His word, and armed them with His authority to represent among their fellows His own especial office of judge. Thus Exod. xxi. 6, "His master shall bring him to the judges," *i.e.*, to the gods or Elohim. So that on the literal interpretation of the Scriptures it was not blasphemy to apply this word to those to whom God had given power above that of men, or to those men to whom God had given power to judge. Did, then, the Lord in saying this disclaim for Himself His true Godhead? No, so far from this He asserted it by implication in the highest sense; for whereas all other beings, whether angels or men, who might be called "gods," were so called because they exercised an inferior and delegated power, He, as the Son of God, exercised the same power as His Father, which resided in Him because He was Son of God, and so partaking of the Father's nature; so that in sustaining all things, in judging, in restoring sight, in tending the sheep of God, and in guarding those sheep in His hand, He co-worked with God; so that here, as in chap. v. 17, 18, the real offence was that He made Himself or called Himself Son of God.

And yet, even here, in deference to their ignorance before the outpouring of the Spirit, He deigns to hide, for a time, the full revelation of His proper Sonship. He is the Son Whom the Father hath consecrated and sent into the world. Such an One has a far higher claim to be called Son than either angel or man, no matter how honoured by God. Let them but accept this one fact, that He comes from God, and they will see that One Who comes from God could not misrepresent His relations to God, and conversely that

37 [i] If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not.

38 But if I do, though ye believe not me, [k] believe the works: that ye may know, and believe, [l] that the Father *is* in me, and I in him.

[i] ch. xv. 24.
[k] ch. v. 36. & x. 10, 11.
[l] ch. xiv. 10, 11. & xvii. 21.

---

38. "That ye may know and believe;" rather, "ye may know and understand." So B., L., and a few versions; but "believe in," ℵ, A., Vulg., later Uncials, Cursives, &c.

God would not acknowledge by such mighty and beneficent miracles One Who misrepresented or exaggerated His relationship to Him. And so, naturally, as it were, He concludes with again appealing to His mighty works.

37. "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works: that ye," &c. "Jesus gave to this assertion the form of an invitation full of kindness. He consented to their not believing Him on His own word, although the testimony of such a Being as Himself carried its proof with it to those who had ears to hear. But the works which the Father had wrought through Him had been added to His own testimony. If they had not ears, they had at least eyes; and if they were not convinced by His words, they ought, at least, to be convinced by His works." (Godet.)

38. "That the Father is in me, and I in him." The Persons of the Ever Blessed Trinity so contain One Another that each One is the full manifestation of the Others. The Father is in Christ, and Christ receives the Fulness of the Spirit, and the Father and the Son come into us, and make their abode in us by the Spirit (ch. xiv. 23).

An objection suggests itself which should be considered for a moment. Moses and the Prophets did some miracles, approaching, at least, in greatness to those which Christ did. Would these miracles prove that they were in God and God in them in the sense in which Christ uses the words? No, for it is clear that in a Theocracy such as that under which the Jews lived, they might have every confidence in God that He would protect them from false workers of miracles. If the prophets, such as Elijah and Elisha, performed miracles, it was a sure sign that their message was true so far as it went. If it be conceivable that any prophet should have said something more of himself than they did, or should have delivered a message requiring more faith, then such a message

39 [m] Therefore they sought again to take him: but he escaped out of their hand,

40 And went away again beyond Jordan into the place [n] where John at first baptized: and there he abode.

41 And many resorted unto him, and said, John did no miracle: [o] but all things that John spake of this man were true.

[m] ch. vii. 30, 44. & viii. 59.

[n] ch. i. 28.

[o] ch. iii. 30.

---

if accredited by such miracles as they performed, would have been true. Now they all believed that a prophet was to come Who was to be greater than all which went before Him, of Whom it was predicted that He should be in the closest possible union with God, nay, even the names of God seemed in some leading prophecies to be given to Him. If the Scriptures were true, that Prophet must come, and it was the universal belief that He was then to be expected. It was contrary then to all their views of God, and of their own relations to God as His people, to suppose that the God Who watched over them should allow them to be deceived by such works as those of Jesus if He were not all that He claimed to be.

39. "Therefore they sought again to take him." It is clear from this second attempt on His life that He had, in their estimation, in no degree qualified, or explained away, His former assertion that He and the Father were one. It has been asked, Was it by a miracle that He escaped out of their hands? If not by an actual miracle it must have been by a special providence as wonderful and as much requiring God's interposition as any miracle, for the Evangelist had declared that they had encircled Him (verse 24).

40. "And went away again beyond Jordan." It would have been, humanly speaking, dangerous for Him to have remained in Jerusalem, where He would have only excited more virulent opposition, and so added to the guilt of the Jews in rejecting Him. So He went away to the scene of His earliest ministry (Bethabara or Bethany), and there He reaped some fruits from the labours of His predecessor, for we read:

41. "And many resorted unto him, and said, John did no miracle: but all things that John spake of this man were true." From this we learn that not only did John bear witness to Him in general terms, and point Him out as the Lamb of God, but that

p ch. viii. 30. & xi. 45.

42 p And many believed on him there.

---

the Baptist must have foretold many other things which He would say and do.

How is it that John did no miracles, and Jesus such stupendous ones? Simply because John was only a forerunner sent to herald the approaching Messiah. All that he had to do was to arouse men's attention to the claims of Another, whereas Jesus had to assert his Oneness with the Father, and that the Father dwelt in Him, and He in the Father. The Baptist had to proclaim "I am not." "I am not the Christ." "I am not the Bridegroom." "I am not the Baptizer with the Holy Ghost." "I am only the Voice." Whereas the word of Jesus was, "I am." "I am the Christ." "I am the Son." "I am the Light." "I am the good Shepherd." "I am He." "I am the Resurrection and the Life."

Again, when we consider that John, even when he did no mighty deeds, had some difficulty in detaching his disciples from himself and attaching them to Christ (iii. 25, 26, and perhaps Matth. xi. 2, 3), how much would this have been increased if John had himself performed miracles!

CHAP. XI.

NOW a certain *man* was sick, *named* Lazarus, of Bethany, the town of a Mary and her sister Martha.

a Luke x. 38, 39.

---

1. "Town." Properly, "village:" Vulg., *castellum*. *Lazarus a Bethania, de castello Mariæ*, &c.

1. "Now a certain man was sick, named Lazarus . . . . her sister Martha." Lazarus is the same name as the Eleazar of the Old Testament. He is described as being "of Bethany, the town [or village] of Mary and her sister Martha." The description in its use of the preposition is exactly the same as that in John i. 44, "Now Philip was of Bethsaida," &c. Very literally rendered it would run, "Lazarus was from Bethany, out of the village of Mary," &c. Re-

2 ([b]It was *that* Mary which anointed the Lord with ointment, and wiped his feet with her hair, whose brother Lazarus was sick.)

[b] Matt. xxvi. 7. Mark xiv. 3. ch. xii. 3.

---

specting this Lazarus nothing whatsoever is known except that from many circumstances of the narrative, as for instance, the number of Jews from Jerusalem who came to comfort the sisters, and the costliness of his sepulchre, his family must have been one of consideration, probably of affluence. From the way in which his name is introduced as the brother of Mary and Martha, neither of whom had been before mentioned by St. John, it seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that St. John had in his mind the passage of St. Luke (x. 38-42) in which Martha is said to have received Jesus into her (not Lazarus's) house. For not only is Lazarus identified as being their brother, but Mary, who from her position in the household is evidently the younger, is mentioned the first, as if she was the best known, which can only be because of the praise which the Lord bestowed upon her as having "chosen the good part," for in the narrative of the miracle in St. John, Martha is unquestionably the more prominent of the two.

2. "(It was that Mary which anointed the Lord with ointment)," &c. Our Lord was twice anointed with ointment by a woman (Luke vii. 38, and John xii. 3), and so it has been assumed by many early commentators that this Mary is the same as the woman of the city which was a sinner, of Luke vii.; but the notices of the two sisters in St. Luke seem to render this impossible, for St. Luke introduces Mary as the sister of Martha, and as hitherto unknown in his narrative, which narrative alone takes notice of the anointing in the house of Simon the Pharisee, whereas the Mary of St. John was evidently the sister of the Martha who was "cumbered about much serving." The confusion of the names probably, in part, arose from both anointings taking place in the house of a Simon; but the circumstances are altogether different, and it is impossible to suppose that the Simons are the same. St. John evidently alluding to the anointing which he himself mentions, which took place on a very different occasion to the first one, and gave rise to very different remarks, and a far more important train of consequences.

3. "Therefore his sisters sent unto him, saying, Lord, behold, he whom thou lovest is sick." The modesty and delicacy of this mes-

3 Therefore his sisters sent unto him, saying, Lord, behold, he whom thou lovest is sick.

4 When Jesus heard *that*, he said, This sickness is not unto death, [c] but for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby.

[c] ch. ix. 3. ver. 40.

5 Now Jesus loved Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus.

---

sage has been often noticed. "Enough that Thou knowest it: for Thou dost not love and forsake." (Augustine.)

4. "When Jesus heard that, he said, This sickness is not unto death," &c. That is, it was not sent as other fatal sicknesses are, to cut short the probation of him who is called hence, but

"For the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby." Observe how He again asserteth that His glory and the Father's is One; for after saying "*of God*," he hath added, "that the Son of God might be glorified." In what respects was this sickness for the glory of the Father and the Son? Not only that opportunity might be given to the Son of God to do a work of His Father's, whereby He might show Himself to be the Resurrection and the Life (ch. v. 21, 26, 27), but for the further and infinitely greater glory which would accrue to God and to Himself by His own Death and consequent Resurrection, to bring about which Death, this raising of Lazarus was one of the necessary antecedents. He foresaw all the consequences which would follow. He went to raise Lazarus, and the fame of that miracle was the immediate cause of His Death at the ensuing Passover.

5. "Now Jesus loved Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus." How is it that this is said, seeing that the Son of Man loves all His brethren, and has come to die for them all, and to bring salvation to all who will not obstinately put it from them? It is said of Him because He is the Son of Man, fully partaking of the nature of His brethren; for have we not all our private affections? Have we not friends whom we regard with more than goodwill? And would Jesus have been perfectly human? would He have had a perfect human soul, if He did not thus love some with more human affection than others? This is one of the places which teach us how truly He is our Brother. The boundless love which dwells in the Infinite God does not overwhelm or supersede the distinguishing affection of the human friend.

6 When he had heard therefore that he was sick, [d] he abode two days still in the same place where he was.

[d] ch. x. 40.

7 Then after that saith he to *his* disciples, Let us go into Judæa again.

8 *His* disciples say unto him, Master, [e] the Jews of late sought to stone thee; and goest thou thither again?

[e] ch. x. 31.

6, 7. "When he had heard therefore that he was sick . . . Then after that saith he," &c. What is the connection between the assertions of verses 5 and 6, for they are connected by a "therefore?" Something of this sort. His love for them did not cause Him to set out at once, but at the time when He saw that it would be best for them and most for the glory of His Father. "In that He intended to glorify Himself in Lazarus, He prepared for the sisters and for him a joy which far outweighed the pains and the death." "He waited for the signal of the Father: God might act in such wise as the *man* Christ Jesus would not of Himself have done; and might prolong this time of waiting for the purpose of rendering the miracle more manifest and more striking, with a view to His own glory and that of His Son." (Godet.)

7. "Then after that saith he to his disciples, Let us go into Judæa again." It is supposed by many that our Lord mentioned Judæa as naturally dwelling in His mind on the hatred of the Jews to Him. But is this likely? If He was in one division of the Holy Land, and desired to go into another, is it not probable that He would say, "Let us go into Judæa, or into Samaria, or into Galilee" as the case might be? Still His question is so ordered as to call forth the exclamation of the Apostles:

8. "Master, the Jews of late sought to stone thee; and goest thou thither again?" Rather, the Jews now, "just now." As the Encænia at which He was present was in December, and the events immediately before His Crucifixion took place some little time after the Resurrection of Lazarus, it was probable that this latter took place early in January—as Dean Burgon notices, about the time of our festival of the Epiphany, the festival of the manifestation of Christ's glory.

It has been said that they feared for themselves as well as for Him, and the remark of Thomas implies that they would be in like

9 Jesus answered, Are there not twelve hours in the day?
f ch. ix. 4. f If any man walk in the day, he stumbleth not,
because he seeth the light of this world.
g ch. xii. 35. 10 But g if a man walk in the night, he stum-
bleth, because there is no light in him.
11 These things said he: and after that he saith unto
h So Deut. xxxi. 16. Dan. xii. 2. Matt. ix. 24. Acts vii. 60. 1 Cor. xv. 18, 51. them, Our friend Lazarus h sleepeth; but I go,
that I may awake him out of sleep.

---

10. "There is no light in him:" rather, "the light is not in him" (Alford and Revisers).

11. "Sleepeth." Alfred and Revisers, "is fallen asleep."

danger. It is, however, one of those many remarks which show how utterly the Apostles were unable to realize that our Lord must, through the suffering of death, enter upon His Glory.

9. "Jesus answered, Are there not twelve hours in the day? . . . . light of this world." This means: "I have a certain work allotted to me of My Father, and a certain time to do it in. That time, though drawing to a close, is not yet expired. Till it is expired, I am working in the light of day—in the light of the Divine Will; and nothing can hinder Me, much less prevent My working by putting Me out of the way. Just as if any man walk in the day, he walks fearlessly and safely because he seeth the light of this world, so it is with Me." But how can the Lord apply to Himself what He next proceeds to say, "If a man walk in the night he stumbleth, because there is no light in him"? Somewhat in this way: "You counsel me to avoid danger which, so long as I walk in the light of my Father's light and guidance, I cannot incur, so that I should be hurt or hindered by it. If, taking your advice, I should now put off the doing of My work to a more distant, and so safer time, I should have to do that duty at a time when God's light would not be shining upon Me, in the hours of night and darkness, and so I should stumble, because I should have chosen to work when the True Light was not shining. I should be working, if such a thing were possible, in the light of My Father's displeasure."

11. "These things said he; and after that he saith unto them, Our friend Lazarus," &c. More literally, "Lazarus our friend is

12 Then said his disciples, Lord, if he sleep, he shall do well.

13 Howbeit Jesus spake of his death: but they thought that he had spoken of taking of rest in sleep.

14 Then said Jesus unto them plainly, Lazarus is dead.

15 And I am glad for your sakes that I was not there, to the intent ye may believe; nevertheless let us go unto him.

---

12. "He shall do well." "He shall recover." *Salvus erit* (Vulg.).

gone to sleep, but I go," &c. Very similar words were used by Him with respect to Jairus' daughter, "The maid is not dead, but sleepeth." Bengel remarks, "With what kindly feeling does Jesus share His own friendship for Lazarus with His disciples!"

12, 13. "Then said his disciples, Lord, if he sleep, he shall do well. . . . . rest in sleep." It is astonishing why they did not ask themselves, "If the sleep of Lazarus were but a wholesome rest, giving the surest hope of his recovery, why should the Lord take a dangerous journey to arouse him from it?" But the great truth of the Resurrection from the dead seems to have been altogether hid from their eyes (Mark ix. 10, Luke xviii. 33, 34), and so they, almost we may say instinctively, avoided considering the things which would have prepared them for it.

14, 15. "Then said Jesus unto them plainly, Lazarus is dead . . . ye may believe." If He had been in the house of the sisters, a necessity would have been, as it were, laid upon Him to raise Lazarus from his bed of sickness, and so the opportunity of strengthening their weak faith, by the far more stupendous miracle of his resurrection, would have been lost.

"That ye may believe." But did they not already believe? Yes, but faith admits of every possible degree, and in us sinful and earth bound creatures is always feeble and fluctuating.

One of them, and he on behalf of all the rest, had confessed that He was the Son of God, and was pronounced supremely blessed for his answer, and the faith it exhibited, and yet the Lord after this said to these same persons, "If ye had faith as a grain of mustard seed," implying that, compared with His own supreme confidence in His Father, they had not even that. The miracle of the Resurrection of Lazarus was especially for the confirmation of the Apostles' faith,

16 Then said Thomas, which is called Didymus, unto his fellowdisciples, Let us also go, that we may die with him.

17 Then when Jesus came, he found that he had *lain* in the grave four days already.

18 Now Bethany was nigh unto Jerusalem, || about fifteen furlongs off:

|| That is, about two miles.

more than for the consolation of the sisters; and we may be sure, from the Lord's words, that they required such a sign to enable them to adhere to Him unto the end. It was a part of that work which He had completed when He said, "those that thou gavest me I have kept." (xvii. 12.)

"Nevertheless let us go unto him." Not unto them, *i.e.*, the mourning sisters, but unto him, as if he were alive.

16. "Then said Thomas, which is called Didymus." Didymus is the Greek rendering of the Hebrew Thoma, and signifies a twin, one of twins. It is remarkable that on the three only occasions in which anything is said of him, his name is mentioned with the explanation of its meaning. This has led many to suppose, and I think with reason, that there is some mystery about his name—that it was given him, perhaps by the Lord Himself, to indicate that there were in him two men, the believer and the unbeliever. He was a man of strong and ardent affection for our Lord, or he would not have been the first to say, "Let us go, that we may die with him," but undoubtedly his feelings towards our Lord were rather those of affection for the man than belief in the Son of God. Here he seems to have forgotten the words of the Lord, "I go that I may awake him out of sleep." He seems to have thought only of the danger to the Lord's life, though the same Lord had assured the disciples that whilst it was day, the day allotted to Him by His Father, He could not stumble—He could not be hindered or thwarted, much less could He be deprived of His Life.

17. "Then when Jesus came, he found that he had lain in the grave four days already." These four days were, first, the day on which the messenger arrived, then the two days in which He tarried in Perœa, and the fourth the one which He took for the journey. We are to remember that most probably Lazarus was dead or died at the time that the messenger arrived, and that the bodies of the dead were usually buried on the day of their death.

19 And many of the Jews came to Martha and Mary, to comfort them concerning their brother.

20 Then Martha, as soon as she heard that Jesus was coming, went and met him: but Mary sat *still* in the house.

---

19. "To Martha and Mary." Tischendorf, after A., C^3., several later Uncials and Cursives, reads, "Came to those [females] about Martha," &c., *i.e.*, to the female household. See below. ℵ, B., C^1., L., Vulg., and Syriac read as in Text. Rec.

20. "Sat still." "Still sat"—"continued sitting."

18. "Now Bethany was nigh unto Jerusalem, about fifteen furlongs off." This is told us in order to account for what is mentioned in the next verse.

19. "And many of the Jews came to Martha and Mary, to comfort them concerning their brother." It is assumed, too hastily, that these Jews were of the party hostile to the Lord. But why should they be? Supposing that they belonged to the "party" friendly to Him, they must be designated as Jews, because they were of the Jewish race, and there was no other name possible when St. John wrote. One would think that, sympathizing as they did so deeply with those whom Jesus loved, they would rather be of the number of those who favoured Him. One commentator even supposes that this was their last trial, and that natural human love gave them once more the opportunity of faith; but surely there must have been a time of acceptance on, and after, Pentecost. Again, how many were there that came to console the sisters? Twenty would, one would think, be a great number for such a purpose, and could these represent Jerusalem and all Judæa?

There is some authority for the reading which requires, "Many of the Jews came to the women [or the female household] about Martha and Mary." Such an expression would imply that the family were in good circumstances.

"To comfort them." This need not be taken in the lowest sense as indicating that they came to assist only in the formal ceremonial mourning, but as showing real sympathy. At least, such would be the judgment of charity.

20. "Then Martha, as soon as she heard," &c. Martha was, no doubt, engaged in some household duty, and so would be the most likely to receive the first report that Jesus was coming.

"But Mary sat still in the house," *i.e.*, continued sitting. Either

21 Then said Martha unto Jesus, Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died.

[i] ch. ix. 31. 22 But I know, that even now, [i] whatsoever thou wilt ask of God, God will give *it* thee.

23 Jesus saith unto her, Thy brother shall rise again

---

in secret grief in her chamber, or with those who had come to comfort the sisters. The reader cannot fail to notice how exactly this accords with the account of the sisters in St. Luke—the one more intent upon household duties, the other more retiring and contemplative.

Martha at once went and met the Lord, and was, perhaps, in such haste as not to communicate the intelligence to Mary, who would certainly have gone quickly (see verses 29 and 31) to meet the Lord if she had known of His coming.

21. "Then said Martha unto Jesus, Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother," &c. These are words of faith in the Lord's power of averting death, and yet there seems a shade of reproach in them, though very subdued, very submissive. But Martha had much more to say. There are hopes, though she ventures only at a distance to allude to them, which she is cherishing still.

22. "But I know, that even now, whatsoever thou wilt ask of God, God will give it thee." "High thoughts and poor thoughts of Christ cross one another here—high thoughts, in that she sees in Him One Whose effectual prayers will greatly prevail; poor thoughts, in that she regards Him as obtaining by prayer that which, indeed, He *has* by the Oneness of His Nature with the Father." (Trench.)

23. "Jesus saith unto her, Thy brother shall rise again." The Lord, of set purpose, speaks ambiguously at first. He desires to draw out from her her own belief in the general Resurrection, and then to connect that belief with Himself. Let us remember His words, "The Father which hath sent me, He gave me a commandment what I should do, and what I should teach" (xii. 49). It would be nothing that she should believe in the Resurrection of her brother as an abnormal thing, as it were. Her brother was to rise at the sound of the same Voice and by the exertion of the same Power which would in due time bring about the general Resurrection.

24 Martha saith unto him, [k] I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day.

25 Jesus said unto her, I am [l] the resurrection,

[k] Luke xiv. 14. ch. v. 29.

[l] ch. v. 21. & vi. 39, 40, 44.

---

24. "Martha saith unto him, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection," &c. The Jews (except the Sadducees) believed in this on the authority of many sayings in the Prophets, "My flesh also shall rest in hope, for thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption." Again, "I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with thy likeness." "Thy dead men shall live, with my dead body shall they arise." "Many that sleep in the dust shall awake." That the belief in the general Resurrection was universal nearly two hundred years before the time of our Lord is plain from the courageous confession of the seven brethren and their mother before Antiochus in 2 Maccabees vii. Thus (verse 9, "When the first was at the last gasp he said, Thou, like a fury, takest us out of the present life, but the King of the world shall raise us up who have died for His laws, unto everlasting life;" and the fourth brother, "It is good, being put to death by men, to look for hope from God to be raised up again by Him" (v. 14). So also the mother. (Verse 23). Such, then, was the common belief and Martha's expression of it. Our Lord next proceeds, in one of the most marvellous and gracious of all His sayings, to identify this Resurrection with Himself.

25. "Jesus said unto her, I am the Resurrection and the Life." Is the Resurrection here the Resurrection of the Body, and the Life here the Life of the Soul? We think rather that He is the Resurrection and the Life both of the body and of the soul. He comes into body and soul, and unites the whole man, body and soul, to Himself. When He comes into any soul He is the Resurrection of that soul from a state of spiritual death to a state of spiritual life; and if we eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, He says that He will raise us up at the last day. He raises up the soul now in the Sacrament of Baptism (Rom. vi. 1-6); or, if it has been separated from Him by sin after its Baptism, at the time of its true repentance or conversion; and the body at the time appointed by God for all men to rise again in their bodies. But how is it that the Resurrection is mentioned first, seeing that He must first be the *Life* of the soul before He can

and the [m] life: [n] he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live:

[m] ch. i. 4. & vi. 35. & xiv. 6. Col. iii. 4. 1 John v. 1, 2, & v. 11.
[n] ch. iii. 36. 1 John v. 10, &c.

---

be the Life of the whole man, body and soul, at the last day? The answer is, that in the case of the soul as well as of the body there is, first, Resurrection and then Life—first Resurrection to a new state or a renewed state of Life, and then continuance in that new state, *i.e.*, Life. If we take Baptism as the Church has ever done [Baptism, of course, not apart from Repentance and Faith] to be the grafting into Him, then in Baptism, as St. Paul twice says (Rom. vi. 1-6, Col. ii. 12), "we are raised with him to walk in newness of life:" and again, the entrance of true realizing Faith where it has not hitherto been exercised, is the Resurrection of the soul from the death of sin unto the Life of Righteousness. There must be this Resurrection of the soul or spirit before there is the Life of the same soul or spirit, Resurrection being a beginning, and Life the continuance of that which is begun.

The soul which truly apprehends the Son of God, by that apprehension, or rather, by his apprehending it (Phil. iii. 12), experiences a Resurrection into a new sphere or state of existence, and the continuance or growing in this new state is Life following on such Resurrection. And the same applies to the body: the rising again at the last day is the restoration of its principle of Life, and the Eternal Life which follows is the continuation through eternity of that which is begun when in the tomb it hears the voice of the Son of God. When He saith "I am the Resurrection and the Life," He speaks as the Second Adam, the New Head of the Race. Is this power then of His to be our Resurrection and our Life to be limited in its exercise to the imparting to us of fresh ideas or new aspirations even after what is best and holiest? He says not so when He tells us, "He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath Eternal Life, and I will raise him up at the last day." Christ is the Resurrection and the Life, not because He raises us up by an act of His power, but because He communicates to us of His whole nature, Body, Soul, and Spirit, to be first our Resurrection, that is, our Restoration to Life,—and then our Life, *i.e.*, the continuance of the Life restored to us.

"He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he

26 And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die. Believest thou this?

27 She saith unto him, Yea, Lord: °I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world.

° Matt. xvi. 16. ch. iv. 42. & vi. 14, 69.

---

live." This is an exposition of the words just uttered. It must refer to a death and a coming to life again in this present state of things, because on this side of the grave only is the saving action of belief contemplated. "He that believeth in me, though he were dead," in sins, "yet shall he live," live by the life of God and Holiness.

26. "And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die." This must refer to the continuing in Him. "Whoso liveth in me and believeth in me shall never die." To understand the first, "He that liveth in me," we must take the "abiding" in Christ of chap. xv. 1-10: and to understand the second, we must take His words in a former discourse: "If a man keep my saying [not, that is, if a man once hear it. and then forget or lose it], but if a man KEEP my saying, he shall never see death" (viii. 51).

"Believest thou this?" This is not, "Dost thou believe anything respecting Me?" but, "Dost thou believe this thing in particular which I have just uttered? Dost thou believe in this aspect of My Person and Work, of My power and goodness which has to do, at this present time, with thy dead brother and with thyself?"

"Believest thou this?" This which Jesus required was an amazing demand upon the faith of this woman, for it was tantamount to asking her whether she believed that the man then before her stood to every human being in a relation so unique that they who rise again to life rise not by an act of His mere power, but in Him as the Second Adam. "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." It was an amazing demand on her faith, but the Faith which He had given her was equal to the demand, and in her answer she set forth the one sole ground on which, as one of the ancient people of God, she could exercise implicit faith in His word, even when he set forth so astonishing a thing respecting Himself.

27. "She saith unto him, Yea, Lord: I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God," &c. In saying this, she said in effect: "I

28 And when she had so said, she went her way, and called Mary her sister secretly, saying, the Master is come, and calleth for thee.

29 As soon as she heard *that*, she arose quickly, and came unto him.

30 Now Jesus was not yet come into the town, but was in that place where Martha met him.

p ver. 19. 31 [p]The Jews then which were with her in the house, and comforted her, when they saw Mary, that she rose up hastily and went out, followed her, saying, She goeth unto the grave to weep there.

32 Then when Mary was come where Jesus was, and saw

---

believe that Thou art the Messiah, the Son of God promised in the writings of our prophets, in David, and Isaiah, and Daniel: and if thou art He, and if Thou comest from the Living God, what bounds can there be to Thy power and Thy truth?" In this she showed that implicit faith which the Apostles had shown when they refused to leave Him, even when He had told them that they must eat His Flesh and drink His Blood, knowing Him to have the words of Eternal Life, and knowing Him to be the Christ, the Son of the Living God, the Holy One of God.

28. "And when she had so said, she went her way, and called Mary her sister secretly." Secretly, no doubt, at the word of Christ, that she might come by herself, and that the Jews might not crowd around her in her way to Him, but that she might be able to speak all that lay on her heart to Him, as her sister had done.

"The Master is come, and calleth for thee." We are not told expressly of this desire of Jesus to see Mary, but it would have been strange if He had performed the miracle when she was absent and yet so near at hand.

29, 30, 31. "As soon as she heard that, she arose quickly. . . . Now Jesus was not yet come into the town. . . . The Jews then that were with her . . . followed her . . . to weep there." All this, though it took place very naturally, was so ordered that many of the Jews should see the miracle.

32. "Then when Mary was come where Jesus was . . . she fell down at his feet . . . Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother

him, she fell down at his feet, saying unto him, [q] Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died.

[q] ver. 21.

33 When Jesus therefore saw her weeping, and the Jews also weeping which came with her, he groaned in the spirit, and [†] was troubled,

[†] Gr. *he troubled himself.*

---

33. "He groaned." See below.
"And was troubled." "Troubled Himself;" *turbavit se ipsum* (Vulg.).

had not died." She fell down at His feet. It is not recorded that Martha did this. Mary being more contemplative and spiritual, having "sat at Jesus' feet," and "chosen the better part," realized more fully the Divine in the Son of God.

"Lord, if thou hadst been here." They both utter the same thing, showing the regretful thoughts that had filled the minds of all the sorrowing household.

33. "When Jesus therefore saw her weeping . . . he groaned in the spirit." "He groaned in the spirit." The word "He groaned" should be translated so as to show that the primary idea of the Greek word is indignation rather than grief. It has been variously rendered as "He was indignant in spirit," "He was chafed in spirit," and by some commentators His own spirit is supposed to be the object of this indignation. "He sternly charged or restrained His spirit," giving it the same meaning as in Matth. ix. 30, where He straitly or sternly charged the blind men, not to make known their restoration to sight. It is very difficult to determine at what He evinced such anger: some suppose that it was at the invincible unbelief of the Jews, whom He foresaw would be moved by this miracle to take more determined and successful proceedings against His Life; some that it was because of the unbelief of the friends and disciples standing by, and so was similar in its cause to His indignation at the disciples when He said to them, "O faithless generation, how long shall I be with you, how long shall I suffer you?" Some (taking the sense of sternly charging) say that it means He vehemently repressed His natural emotions. Perhaps the best explanation is that He was indignant at the effects of sin, so vividly brought before Him in the victory of death over His friend, in the grief of the bereaved sisters, and in the hypocrisy of some of the Jews, and the deadly hate of others.

34 And said, Where have ye laid him? They said unto him, Lord, come and see.

r Luke xix. 14. 35 r Jesus wept.

---

34. "And said, Where have ye laid him? They said . . . Lord, come and see." "Where have ye laid him?" not as asking for information, as if He were ignorant, but to engage their attention, and perhaps stimulate them to expect something great from One Who had hitherto done such works of power and grace.

35. "Jesus wept." What a world of grace and love is there in this short verse! "Why was our Blessed Saviour thus affected? Was it the sight of human sorrows that came home to the compassionate heart of the Son of Man? Yet those sorrows He knew that He would immediately remove. And to believe on Him was to be free from all these sorrows and from death. Yet He wept, because, says one, He was Himself the very fountain of pity; He weeps and mingles with us human tears, although the cause of these tears is our want of faith: He is as One weak in our weakness, and sad in our sadness, weeping with them that weep. And thus does He take upon Himself human impressions, and sanctifies to us human sorrows. Adorable sorrows of the Son of God! how does He take unto Himself and then offer up unto the Father, as hallowed and blessed in Himself all human sorrows, rejecting not our griefs, but sealing thereby the blessing of those that weep, and giving us the pledge that, 'He that now goeth on his way weeping, shall doubtless come again with joy and bring his sheaves with him.'"—(Isaac Williams.)

But most wonderful words upon this passage are the following, which I am thankful for the opportunity of reproducing: "He wept from very sympathy with the grief of others. 'When Jesus saw Mary weeping, and the Jews also weeping which came with her, he groaned in the spirit and was troubled.' It is the very nature of compassion or sympathy, as the word implies, to 'rejoice with those that rejoice, and weep with those that weep.' We know it is so with men; and God tells us He also is compassionate and full of tender mercy. Yet we do not well know what this means, for how can God rejoice or grieve? By the very perfection of His nature Almighty God cannot show sympathy, at least to the comprehension of beings of such limited minds as ours. He indeed is

36 Then said the Jews, Behold how he loved him!

37 And some of them said, Could not this man, [s]which opened the eyes of the blind, have caused that even this man should not have died?

[s] ch. ix. 6.

---

hid from us; but if we were allowed to see Him how could we discern in the Eternal and Unchangeable signs of sympathy? Words and works of sympathy He does display to us: but it is the very sight of sympathy in another that affects and comforts the sufferer, more even than the fruits of it. Now we cannot see God's sympathy, and the Son of God, though feeling for us as great compassion as His Father, did not show it to us while He remained in His Father's Bosom. But when He took flesh and appeared on earth, He showed us the Godhead in a new manifestation. He invested Himself with a new set of attributes, those of our flesh, taking unto Him a human soul and body, in order that thoughts, feelings, affections, might be His which could respond to ours, and certify to us His tender mercy. When, then, our Saviour weeps from sympathy at Mary's tears, let us not say it is the love of a man overcome by natural feeling. It is the love of God, the bowels of compassion of the Almighty and Eternal, condescending to appear as we are capable of receiving it, in the form of human nature." (J. H. Newman, Ser. X., 3rd vol.)

36. "Then said the Jews, Behold how he loved him!" This could hardly have been said by persons belonging to the party hostile to Jesus; indeed, it is very improbable that more than one or two of such should have come from Jerusalem to console those whom Jesus loved.

37. "And some of them said, Could not this man which opened," &c. This was the most natural question for those to ask who believed in our Lord's power to heal the sick, and restore sight to the blind, but who were ignorant of the reason which induced him to linger in Perea when He heard of the news of the sickness of His friend. It is, in fact, little more than the sisters' exclamation, "If thou hadst been here, my brother had not died."

A much more evil significance has been given to this question by those who have got themselves to believe that the principal reason for the writing of this Gospel was to put on record certain stages in the progress of the unbelief of the Jews, but I cannot think that it

38 Jesus therefore again groaning in himself cometh to the grave. It was a cave, and a stone lay upon it.

39 Jesus said, Take ye away the stone. Martha, the sister of him that was dead, saith unto him, Lord, by this time he stinketh: for he hath been *dead* four days.

40 Jesus saith unto her, Said I not unto thee, that, if [s] ver. 4, 23. thou wouldest believe, thou shouldest [s] see the glory of God?

41 Then they took away the stone *from the place* where

---

11. "From the place where the dead was laid," omitted by ℵ, B., C., D., L., old Latin, Vulg., Peshito, &c.; retained by A., E., G., H., M., and most Cursives.

indicates anything more than what would naturally suggest itself under the circumstances to an indifferent person.

38. "Jesus therefore again groaning in himself," &c. The same word in the original which is used in verse 33. Here it may probably have more of the meaning of sternly restraining or curbing His feelings.

"It was a cave, and a stone lay upon it." It was, that is, in a chamber hollowed out of the rock, or out of the side of a hill, and consequently was a costly place of burial; showing, in connection with other things, that the family of Bethany were in very good circumstances.

39. "Jesus said, Take ye away the stone . . . by this time he stinketh," &c. This clearly shows, that though she might have had some hope that the Lord would do some work for their consolation, yet that this hope was exceedingly vague, and did not contemplate for a moment that the Lord would restore to life a body in which corruption had already set in. There was also a natural shrinking from the exposure of her brother's remains, so that they should be an offence to the bystanders.

40. "Jesus said unto her, Said I not unto thee . . . see the glory of God?" Our Lord had not said this to Martha when she met Him, so in all probability He alludes to the words, "This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God" (verse 3). This was said, no doubt, in the hearing of him who had brought the message from the sisters, and on his return was reported to them as the Lord intended.

41. "Then they took away the stone." The reader will mark

the dead was laid. And Jesus lifted up *his* eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me.

42 And I knew that thou hearest me always: but [u] because of the people which stand by I said *it*, that they may believe that thou hast sent me.

[u] ch. xii. 30.

---

the contrast here between this resurrection and that of the Lord. The body of Lazarus was raised up a natural body, and so the stone must be removed to enable it to emerge from the tomb: the Body of the Lord was raised up a spiritual Body, and so after His Resurrection the angel rolled away the stone to show that the tomb was empty.

"And Jesus lifted up his eyes . . . Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me." Did then the Son of God perform His miracles after prayer? Most assuredly; but not as we understand it, because our prayer is a beseeching of God for what He may, or for what He may not see fit to grant, at least at the time we ask, and in the form in which we ask that it may be granted; whereas the prayer of Christ was a prayer for what He knew the Father had in His counsel determined upon, because of Their Oneness of mind and will. His intercourse was, as it were, a perpetual uniting of His own will with His Father's; a perpetual breathing of "Thy will be done."

Even to mere men God has given such a promise as, "Before they call I will answer, and while they are yet speaking I will hear;" and if it can be so with us who are separate from God, what must it be with One Who is "in the Father, and the Father in Him?" The Lord having secret and unbroken intercourse with His Father, which recognizes no limitations of time, speaks of that as certain and as having taken place, which was yet, in the eyes of men, about to take place, and gives thanks accordingly.

Upon this we must imagine a small interval, and then He says:

42. "And I knew that thou hearest me always: but because of the people which stand by I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me."

To enter into something of the meaning of these words, we must remember that it was the most earnest desire of the Lord that the power and glory of all the works which He did should be ascribed to the Father; and that any glory which must of neces-

43 And when he thus had spoken, he cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth.

---

sity accrue to Him, should be ascribed to Him, not as independent of, but as one with the Father; and so that it should never for a moment cross the mind of any man that He was a separate and independent Divine Existence. He seems earnest in disclaiming any separate power in the doing of His works, as well as any separate will in originating them. "I came from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent Me." "The Father that dwelleth in Me, He doeth the works" (vi. 38, xiv. 10). God then hearing Him always with that secret ineffable hearing which transcends the utterance of all words, it might seem superfluous to thank God for having heard Him. Might it not imply that He was sometimes heard and sometimes not heard? But to give no ground for such a surmise, He thanked God aloud as the Author of the miracle, that the people might know that He disclaimed all glory apart from the Father, and that they might believe that the Father had sent Him. To believe that God had in very deed sent Jesus from Himself, was, at that time, all-sufficient. It carried all else with it—Messiahship, Sonship, Mediatorship Judgeship all He claimed to be, belonged to Jesus if He was "sent of God."

43. "And when he had thus spoken, he cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth." Literally, He shouted, for in most of the places where the word is used it means no less than this. As Luthardt says, "Κραυγάζειν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, to cry with a loud voice, is purposely heaped up to express the strength of t[illegible] call." What is the significance, for this is the only place where the Lord is said thus to shout? The tomb was already uncovered, and Jesus was close to it. Some say that it was done to contrast with the mutterings and incantations of magicians, but this seems a very unworthy explanation. Some, that the Jews around might hear, but the word is never used respecting our Lord when He addressed far greater multitudes. Some that it was to express authority and power. He called him not as a friend, but commanded him as Lord and Master. But must we not rather understand it as if He would have us believe that His voice must penetrate into the unseen world, and call the spirit forth from the place allotted to it by God? For, in this raising

44 And he that was dead came forth, bound hand and foot with graveclothes: and [x] his face was bound [x] ch xx. 7

---

of Lazarus there was a threefold miracle: there was the reversal of the corruption of the body, so that it should come forth in health and soundness; there was the restoration of the animal life, by which the heart beat and the blood again coursed through the veins; and there was, above all, the summoning of the spirit from the receptacle of spirits, and re-embodying it and enthroning it again in the secret place from which it rules the whole frame.

But, besides this, there was another act of authority in the spiritual world far greater than any in the physical, for the Lord here exercised the office of supreme Arbiter in giving to one whose term of probation had been closed, a renewal of that term, so that at the general Resurrection he would have to render account for perhaps twenty or thirty years more of opportunities of glorifying God. Truly indeed may we say of this Voice of Jesus Christ, "The voice of the Lord is mighty in operation, the voice of the Lord is a glorious voice." And this Voice will be still more mighty when, at the last day, it will be heard, not in one grave, but in all. May God grant that when he who writes these lines and he who reads them hear it, they both may rise to everlasting life, and not to shame and everlasting contempt!

44. "And he that was dead came forth, bound hand and foot with graveclothes: and his face was bound about," &c. It has been asked whether it was a miracle, or part of the miracle, that the dead should rise up and come out of the sepulchre by the power of the Lord, and not by the use of his own limbs? Now why should the Evangelist expressly mention that he was "bound hand and foot with grave-clothes," except for the purpose of showing that the grave-clothes prevented all natural motion? The only other place where this "binding hand and foot" is mentioned is in Matthew xxii. 13, where the man so treated is deprived of all power of his limbs, so that he has not to be *led* but *cast* out into the outer darkness. It appears to have been necessary for the satisfaction of the hostile Jews who had had no opportunity of being convinced that he was really dead, and who, if he had emerged from the tomb with the free use of his limbs, would have most certainly denied the fact of his death.

about with a napkin. Jesus saith unto them, Loose him, and let him go.

45 Then many of the Jews which came to Mary, [y] and had seen the things which Jesus did, believed on him.

[y] ch. ii. 23. & x. 42. & xii. 11, 18.

46 But some of them went their ways to the Pharisees, and told them what things Jesus had done.

"Jesus saith unto them, Loose him, and let him go." This command of Jesus to "loose him, and let him go," implied that he could not loose himself, and that he could not walk away of himself. It has even been taken as betokening the power which Christ has entrusted to His Ministers or Priests to loose by absolution from the bands of sin those whom He has Himself quickened by His word of converting power. This is admirably stated by St. Augustine in the following: "Dost thou marvel how he came forth with his feet bound, and not marvel that he rose being four days dead? In both was the power of the Lord, not the strength of the dead man. He came forth, and yet was he still bound: still wrapped round, and yet already he hath come abroad. What does this betoken? When thou despisest thou liest dead, and if thou despisest these so great things of which I have spoken, thou liest buried; when thou confessest, thou comest forth. For what is it to come forth, but by issuing as it were from what is hidden to be made manifest? But then that [issuing] thou shouldest confess is God's doing, by crying with a mighty voice, that is, by calling with a mighty grace. Accordingly, when the dead man had come forth still bound, confessing, yet still guilty, in order that his sins should be loosed, the Lord said this to His ministers, 'Loose him, and let him go.' How loose him, and let him go? 'That ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.'"

45, 46. "Then many of the Jews which came to Mary .... told them what things Jesus had done." It seems scarcely credible that any of the Jews who were on such terms with the family of Bethany, and had come to mourn with them for the loss of their brother, should have at once gone to the Pharisees to betray the Lord out of malice; but there is no need to make any such a supposition. For the verse may be rendered, "Then many of the Jews, even those which came to Mary, ... believed in Him. But some of them, *i.e.*, of the Jews generally, and not of those which

47 ¶ [z]Then gathered the chief priests and the Pharisees a council, and said, [a]What do we? for this man doeth many miracles.

48 If we let him thus alone, all *men* will believe on him: and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation.

49 And one of them, *named* [b]Caiaphas, being the high priest that same year, said unto them, Ye know nothing at all,

[z] Ps. ii. 2. Matt. xxvi. 3. Mark xiv. 1. Luke xxii. 2.
[a] ch. xii. 19. Acts iv. 16.
[b] Luke iii. 2. ch. xviii. 14. Acts iv. 6.

---

came to Mary, went their ways to the Pharisees." But even supposing that these last were of the number of those who had come to the sisters, it must not be too hastily concluded that they went in sheer malice. It is not improbable that they were persons of weak minds who knew not what to make of the matter, and went for some sort of guidance to the recognized religious leaders.

47. "Then gathered . . . . What do we? for this man doeth many miracles." "What do we?" not, what shall we do? but what are we doing? as if the case was very urgent indeed.

"This man doeth many miracles." Mark here how they said among one another what they really believed. How marvellously do we see in their conduct the words of the Saviour fulfilled, "If they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." We learn from this that the will of man has power to set aside the force of the clearest evidence, so that the man should not act upon it, and should reject the conclusion to which it necessarily leads. This unbelief being immoral arose from an impenitent state of heart; they were not persuaded when the Lord Himself rose from the dead.

48. "If we let him thus alone, all men will believe on him . . . place and nation"—*i.e.*, all men will combine to make Him King, and there will be a dangerous tumult, which will end in the Romans coming and taking away our place and nation; our place, *i.e.*, our Temple, the one place of our religion—our nation, so as to destroy the few remains of national life and independence left to us.

49. "One of them, named Caiaphas, being the high priest that same year," &c. As if he said, Why do ye hesitate? One man's life must be sacrificed to save the nation from destruction by the

53 [c] Nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one
[c] ch. xviii. 14. man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not.

51 And this spake he not of himself: but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation;

51, 52. "That nation;" rather, "the nation."

Roman power. He is much too dangerous to be tolerated. If He is allowed to live the whole nation will perish.

51. "This spake he not of himself." He himself used the words "One man must die for the people," in his own unjust and wicked sense, but he knew not that in using these words he was not speaking of himself, but God was prophesying by him. He held a priesthood, which, though he was doing his utmost to degrade and prostitute it, was even yet the most sacred of all human offices. The people of the Jews were even yet the people of God, and he was their head so far as they were a Theocracy, and God, because of this his most sacred office, made his accursed lips the means of declaring the all-atoning significance of the Death which he desired to bring about. He urged the Death for a political purpose, and God made his words to foretell universal Atonement. Godet has some very suggestive remarks: "Since Caiaphas was high priest for eleven consecutive years, why did St. John, three times over (vv. 49, 51, xviii. 13), use the expression, high priest, *that year*? Certainly because he desired to recall the importance of that unique and decisive year, in which the perfect Sacrifice terminated the typical sacrifices, and the Levitical priesthood as exercised by Caiaphas. It devolved upon the high priest to offer every year the great atoning sacrifice for the sins of the people, and this was the office now performed by Caiphas, as the last representative of the ancient priesthood. By his vote he, in some degree, appointed and sacrificed the Victim, Who, in that ever memorable year, 'was to bring in everlasting righteousness,'" &c. "In the Old Testament, the normal centre of the Theocratic nation was not the king, but the priest. In all the great crises of the nation's fate, it was the high priest who received, in virtue of a prophetic gift communicated for the occasion, the decision of the Most High for the welfare of His people. (Num. xxvii. 21, 1 Sam. xxx. 7, &c.) St. John by no means asserts that

52 And [d] not for that nation only, [e] but that also he should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad.

53 Then from that day forth they took counsel together for to put him to death.

54 Jesus [f] therefore walked no more openly among the Jews; but went thence unto a country near to the wilderness, into a city called [g] Ephraim, and there continued with his disciples.

[d] Is. xlix. 6. 1 John ii. 2.
[e] ch. x. 16. Ephes. ii. 14, 15, 16, 17.
[f] ch. iv. 1, 3. & vii. 1.
[g] See 2 Chron. xiii. 19.

54. "A country." Properly, "the country."

the high priest was generally endowed with this prophetic power; he merely regards Caiaphas as playing, at this decisive moment, the part assigned him in such cases as God's accredited organ to His people, and that notwithstanding the contrast existing between his individual character and the spirit of his office."

52. "And not for that nation only," &c. The Evangelist here notices the very wide significance of this prophecy. Caiphas by "the people" meant to signify the Jews only, but God, Who overruled his words, meant by it a far more numerous people, the true people of God, then scattered throughout the world, who would embrace the faith of the Son of God. It is the echo of the Lord's prophecy, "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold, them also I must bring . . . . and they shall be one flock and one Shepherd."

53. "Then from that day forth they took counsel together for to put him to death." Having determined that He must die, they henceforth took counsel how the death was to be accomplished. This seems recorded to show that they intended at once to put Him out of the way. But his time, though fast approaching, was not yet come. He could only die at the Paschal Feast, as the Paschal Victim, and so we read in the next verse,

54. "Jesus therefore walked no more openly among the Jews." He withdrew Himself again, though only for a few weeks.

"But went thence unto a country near to the wilderness." Rather into the country as opposed to the town or city.

"Into a city called Ephraim," &c. According to Jerome, a town in a thinly-peopled country, twenty miles to the north-east of

55 ¶ [h] And the Jews' passover was nigh at hand: and many went out of the country up to Jerusalem before the passover, to purify themselves.

[h] ch. ii. 13. & v. 1. & vi. 4.

56 [i] Then sought they for Jesus, and spake among themselves, as they stood in the temple, What think ye, that he will not come to the feast?

[i] ver. 8. ch. vii. 11.

57 Now both the chief priests and the Pharisees had given a commandment, that, if any man knew where he were, he should shew *it*, that they might take him.

Jerusalem. The place was, from its situation, suited to our Lord's design to keep out of the way of the Jews, till His hour was come, and yet be near Jerusalem.

55. "The Jews' passover was nigh at hand." This is one instance amongst several in which St. John uses the word "Jews" with no sinister meaning as signifying those opposed to Christ, but simply as designating the nation. Thus he speaks of the Jews' feast of tabernacles (vii. 2), and of a feast of the Jews (v. 1).

"To purify themselves." Apparently none of the sacrifices of which part, or the whole, were partaken of by the people, could be properly eaten by unclean persons (Levit. vii. 20). In 2 Chronicles xxx. 18, 19, it is recorded that the King prayed specially for those who had eaten the Passover in a state of uncleanness. No doubt they had better opportunities in Jerusalem for keeping from defilement, than if they were at their homes engaged in their usual business.

56. "Then sought they for Jesus," &c. This verse very graphically describes the excitement, even amongst those who had come up from the country for the feast, about the person and claims of Jesus. It could not have been written except by one who had observed with deep anxiety the groups questioning among themselves whether the fear of the rulers would deter the Lord from coming up.

57. "Now both the chief priests and the Pharisees had given a commandment." This may be recorded to account for the questioning of the last verse as to whether Jesus would be deterred from coming up, and also for the opportunity given for Judas to betray Him.

CHAP. XII.

THEN Jesus six days before the passover came to Bethany, [a] where Lazarus was which had been dead, whom he raised from the dead. [a] ch. xi. 1, 43.

2 [b] There they made him a supper; and Martha served: but Lazarus was one of them that sat at the table with him. [b] Matt. xxvi. 6. Mark xiv. 3.

---

1. "Which had been dead," omitted by ℵ, B, L., Old Latin (a, c, e), Syriac, but retained in A., D., most later Uncials, all Cursives, some Old Latin, Vulg.

1. "Then Jesus six days before the passover came to Bethany . . . . raised from the dead." There are very great differences of opinion amongst commentators as to the day on which this took place. Taking Friday, the day on which our Lord was crucified, to be the day of the Passover (*i.e.* of the killing of the Paschal Lamb, at about the time at which our Lord was slain), six days before this would be the Saturday before. It is not likely that on this day, being the Jewish Sabbath, our Lord would have taken the long journey from the house of Zaccheus, where He lodged (Luke xix. 5) on His way from Ephraim to Jerusalem by Jericho. So that it is best to suppose that He took the journey on the Friday, so as to arrive at Bethany on the commencement of the Sabbath, *i.e.* about six o'clock on Friday evening. He would spend the Sabbath at Bethany, and on the evening of that day they would make Him the supper. Then on the next day, answering to our Palm Sunday, He would, probably late in the day, make His entry into Jerusalem.

2. "There they made him a supper . . . . at the table with him." St. Matthew and St. Mark tell us that this supper was in the house of Simon the Leper, that is, one who had been a leper, and had been, no doubt, healed by our Lord; for it is impossible to suppose that one who was on such friendly terms with Him as to receive Him into his house, would have been permitted to remain afflicted with such a loathsome disease.

"Martha served: but Lazarus was one of those that sat," &c.

3 Then took [c] Mary a pound of ointment of spikenard, very costly, and anointed the feet of Jesus, and wiped his feet with her hair: and the house was filled with the odour of the ointment.

[c] Luke x. 38, 39. ch. xi. 2.

3. "Spikenard." Perhaps the words νάρδου πιστικῆς mean pure nard.

This seems decisive as to the fact that the supper was not in Martha's own house, as the widow of this Simon, as some have conjectured. Martha served, not as the mistress of her own house, but in another's, to show her deep devotion to our Lord.

"Lazarus was one of them," &c. This seems mentioned as if it were not a matter of course, which it would have been, if the feast had taken place in the house of the sisters.

3. "Then took Mary a pound of ointment of spikenard . . . . the house was filled with the odour of the ointment." The reader will remember that the incident which follows is mentioned by St. John alone in its proper chronological order. St. Matthew and St. Mark both insert it, as it were, parenthetically, apparently to account for the treachery of Judas arising from his disappointment at the loss of the three hundred pence to the bag; but neither Evangelist mentions his name as the murmurer, nor that of Mary. From St. Matthew's account, we should judge that it was the disciples generally which "had indignation," and very likely the greater part shared in it, as not yet realizing the unutterable sacredness of the Body of the Lord. St. John gives us the key. Judas out of covetousness and fraud led the way in the murmuring, and being disappointed of dishonest gain in one quarter, looked out for it in another.

As the account of what occurred at this supper is given with variations (all perfectly reconcilable) by each of the Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and John, it may be well to notice the special points of difference in each account.

"Jesus therefore (according to St. John) six days before the Passover came to Bethany, where Lazarus was whom he raised from the dead." St. John here mentions the date, and begins to connect the matter with the family of Bethany. St. Matthew says nothing about the supper being given to the Lord. "Now when Jesus was in Bethany, in the house of Simon the Leper, there came unto him a woman having," &c. "As he sat at meat:" as if He was

4 Then saith one of his disciples, Judas Iscariot, Simon's *son*, which should betray him,

5 Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence, and given to the poor?

---

4. "Judas Iscariot, Simon's son." "Judas the Iscariot" (omitting "Simon's son") read in ℵ, B., L., some Cursives (1, 33, 118, 209, 219), Vulg., and Peshito. "Simon's son" retained in A., most later Uncials and Cursives.

5. "Three hundred pence." This sum in the time of the Emperors would be about ten guineas.

taking an ordinary meal. So also St. Mark, without any difference. "Then took Mary [St. John] a pound of ointment of spikenard, very costly, and anointed the feet of Jesus, and wiped his feet with her hair, and the house was filled with the odour of the ointment." St. Matthew only says: "There came unto him a woman having an alabaster box of very precious ointment, and poured it on his head." St. Mark adds, that the ointment was ointment of spikenard, and that she broke the box.

St. John mentions Judas alone as murmuring. St. Matthew, as I have noticed, leads us to believe that the body of the disciples joined in the complaint: "When his disciples saw it they had indignation, saying, To what purpose is this waste?" St. Mark seems to say that only some of those present murmured, "There were some that had indignation," &c.

St. John alone, who mentions Judas as the murmurer, gives the real reason for his discontent. "This he said, not that he cared for the poor, but because he was a thief, and had the bag," *i.e.* the common purse of Jesus and His disciples.

The two Synoptics are much fuller than St. John in their report of the Lord's rebuke: how she had wrought a good work on Him, how she unconsciously poured it on His Body as anticipating His Burial, how the fame of her good deed would be spread abroad as her memorial, wherever the Gospel was preached. It is to be remarked that St. John does not mention this, but he does mention that which cannot but be a mysterious forecast of it, that 'the house was filled with the odour of the ointment." St. John records only a small part of the Lord's answer, "Let her alone: against the day of my burying hath she kept this;" or, if we are obliged to accept the less intelligible reading, "Suffer that she may keep this against the day of my burying."

6 This he said, not that he cared for the poor; but be-
[d] ch. xiii. 29. cause he was a thief, and [d] had the bag, and bare what was put therein.

---

6. "Bag," or "box" (Revisers in margin).
"Bare." "Took away" (Alford and Revisers).

The reader will now see the extreme importance of St. John's account of the matter. It makes clear to us two things which would otherwise have been inexplicable, the devotion of the woman and the fall of Judas.

We know from what St. John has recorded that the woman so honouring the Lord, and so honoured by Him, was not some chance stranger, but the devout, contemplative Mary, who had chosen the better part, and who performed the costly act of sacrifice out of deep gratitude for the restoration of her brother, and by so doing sealed the Lord's Body for burial.

And we also learn the mystery of the fall of Judas, so far as man can know it. As recorded in the Synoptics it is simply portentous —an act of extreme wickedness, without any sufficient antecedents, as if he had suddenly, and without reason, plunged from the highest heaven to the lowest hell. But St. John shows us that it was the outcome of a course of petty thefts, committed under the very eye of the Redeemer, and no doubt with a full consciousness that He respecting Whom Judas had ample evidence that He knew all things, was cognisant of each particular act of fraud. So here was one who, with the exception of his fellow apostles, had greater spiritual advantages than any other man ever enjoyed; one who, for two or three years, had observed the holy Life, seen the miracles, heard the words, and received the warnings of the Son of God Himself, and was hardened under it all, and went from one act of wickedness to another, and yet kept up such an appearance of righteousness, that it never crossed the minds of any one of his fellow apostles that he would be the traitor. (Matth. xxvi. 22.)

For further remarks on this matter I must refer the reader to my notes on St. Mark's Gospel, ch. xiv. 1-12.

A word must be said here on the difference of reading of our Lord's words respecting the mystical nature of the anointing. St. John, if we follow the received text, reads, "Let her alone, against the day of my burial hath she kept this," which, though differing in

7 Then said Jesus, Let her alone: against the day of my burying hath she kept this.

8 For [e] the poor always ye have with you; but me ye have not always.

[e] Matt. xxvi. 11. Mark xiv. 7.

9 Much people of the Jews therefore knew that he was there: and they came not for Jesus' sake only, but that they might see Lazarus also, [f] whom he had raised from the dead.

[f] ch. xi. 43, 44.

---

7. "Against the day of my burying hath she kept this." So A., later Uncials, most Cursives, and Syriac (Peshito); but ℵ, B., D., K., L., some Cursives (33, 42, 145, 157), most Old Latin, Vulgate and Coptic versions read, "that she may keep this against the day of my burial."

9. Some MSS. (ℵ, B., L.) insert article, and read, "the great multitude," *i.e.*, "the common people," "the mass;" but Vulg., *turba multa ex Judæis*.

words, is the same in sense with the Lord's words in St. Matthew and St. Mark; but the MSS. of the so-called Neutral Text, together with the Old Latin and Vulgate, have a reading which, if it have any meaning at all, implies that Mary might keep, or had intended to keep, some of the ointment wherewith to anoint His dead Body. "Suffer her to keep it against the day of my burying." From this some have thought that the whole of the contents of the box or vial were not at this time poured on the Lord, but that part, perhaps owing to this very interruption, was reserved for a more sacred purpose. Godet remarks: "This reading [*i.e.*, that of the Neutral Text], however translated, does not present any passable meaning. It is an unfortunate correction by the hand of critics who were occupied with the notion that no man is embalmed before his death. The received reading, on the contrary, offers a sense at once clear and refined. Jesus bestowed on the act of Mary just what it lacked in the eyes of Judas, an aim at practical usefulness. 'It is not for nothing, as your reproaches suggest, that she has poured out this perfume. She has embalmed Me beforehand, and has thus, by anticipation, made to-day the day of My burial.'"

9. "Much people of the Jews therefore," &c. Very probably the "Jews" here are to be taken as those of Judæa and Jerusalem who had been hitherto much more indifferent to the claims of Jesus than the Galileans and those beyond Jordan.

10. "But the chief priests consulted that they might put Lazarus also to death," &c. No more malignant opposition to the most

10 ¶ [g] But the chief priests consulted that they might put
[g] Luke xvi. 31. Lazarus also to death;

[h] ch. xi. 45. ver. 18. 11 [h] Because that by reason of him many of the Jews went away, and believed on Jesus.

[i] Matt. xxi. 8. Mark xi. 8. Luke xix. 35, 36, &c. 12 ¶ [i] On the next day much people that were come to the feast, when they heard that Jesus was coming to Jerusalem,

13 Took branches of palm trees, and went forth
[k] Ps. cxviii. 25, 26. to meet him, and cried, [k] Hosanna: Blessed *is* the King of Israel that cometh in the name of the Lord.

[l] Matt. xxi. 7. 14 [l] And Jesus, when he had found a young ass, sat thereon; as it is written,

[m] Zech. ix. 9. 15 [m] Fear not, daughter of Sion: behold, thy King cometh, sitting on an ass's colt.

---

13. "The King of Israel that cometh in the name of the Lord." א, B., L., read, "Blessed be He that cometh in the name of the Lord, and the King of Israel."

striking evidence of God's power and presence with Jesus is conceivable. It seems scarcely human, but Satanic in its strength and determination of purpose. "O the foolish thought and blind rage! If the Lord Jesus had power to raise him, being dead, had He not power to raise him being put to death? In putting Lazarus to death, can ye put away the Lord's power? If it seems to you that a dead man is one thing, a man put to death another: behold the Lord did both, both Lazarus who was dead, and Himself who was put to death, He raised to life again." (Augustine.)

12-16. Here follows a short notice of the triumphal entry into Jerusalem, nearly all the details respecting the finding of the ass or colt, the multitude strawing their garments in the way, the murmurings of the Pharisees, and our Lord's answer to them, being omitted. The Evangelist's motive for the insertion of his short account is clear at a glance. It is that he may show the reason why so vast a concourse of people came and met the Lord, and attended Him on His entry into Jerusalem. If we had only the narrative of the Synoptics this would be inexplicable, but St. John connects it with the raising of Lazarus in the words, "The people

16 These things [n]understood not his disciples at the first: [o]but when Jesus was glorified, [p]then remembered they that these things were written of him, and *that* they had done these things unto him.

n Luke xviii. 34.
o ch. vii. 39.
p ch. xiv. 26.

17 The people therefore that was with him when he called Lazarus out of his grave, and raised him from the dead, bare record.

18 [q]For this cause the people also met him, for that they heard that he had done this miracle.

q ver. 11.

17. Tischendorf reads "that" instead of "when." "The people also that was with him bare record that he raised Lazarus from the dead." This reading is supported by D., E., K., L., Old Latin; but ℵ, A., B., and most other authorities read "when."

therefore that was with him when he called Lazarus out of his grave, and raised him from the dead, bare record. For this cause the people also met him, for that they heard that he had done this miracle."

Another reason for the insertion of this short notice of what is so much more fully given in the other Evangelists, is to give St. John the opportunity of repeating what he had before said plainly (chap. ii. 22), or intimated (chap. vii. 39, viii. 28), that many of the acts and sayings of the Lord were not understood at the time, that the prophecies respecting His works and sufferings as the Messiah were very vaguely applied to Him, and that the things which those about Him were led to do to Him—such, for instance, as the Anointing His Body to the Burial—were done without a consciousness of their true significance. They did now what they did in honour, as they thought, of a great prophet [This is Jesus the prophet of Nazareth of Galilee], but it was really significant of the fulfilment of a prophecy that the King of Israel Himself, not only the Offspring, but the Root of David, should in such wise enter into "the city of the Great King."

17, 18. "The people therefore that was with him . . . . heard that he had done this miracle." There were two crowds. The one, the smaller, of course, which came with Him from Bethany, which had seen the miracle of the raising of Lazarus, and the people from Jerusalem, who, attracted by the fame of it, had come to meet Him; and the two accompanied Him in one body to Jerusalem, praising

19 The Pharisees therefore said among themselves, [f] Perceive ye how ye prevail nothing? behold, the world is gone after him.

[f] ch. xi. 47, 48.

20 ¶ And there [s] were certain Greeks among them [t] that came up to worship at the feast:

[s] Acts xvii. 4.

[t] 1 Kings viii. 41, 42. Acts viii. 27.

21 The same came therefore to Philip, [u] which was of Bethsaida of Galilee, and desired him, saying, Sir, we would see Jesus.

[u] ch. i. 44.

---

19. "Perceive ye;" or, "Ye perceive."

and blessing God "for all the mighty works that they had seen." (Luke xix. 37.)

19. "The Pharisees therefore said," &c. These words said in utter despair at the rapidly growing popularity of the Lord, seem to show that they felt that the time for half measures was past, and that they must now, without delay, throw themselves into the bolder and more unscrupulous counsels of the chief priests.

20. "And there were certain Greeks among them that came up," &c. Here follows an incident respecting which we would fain know something more than what the Evangelist has told us. Who were these Greeks? of what country? were they connected with that remarkable embassy which Abgarus of Edessa is said by Eusebius to have sent to Jesus, and which can scarcely be altogether an invention, but must have had some foundation in truth, or were they chance proselytes who had come to Jerusalem to worship, and desired to know from Christ's own lips whether His doctrine was for the Gentiles? But nothing whatsoever is told us, except what enables the Evangelist to give the short discourse of the Lord which naturally arises out of the incident. Some suppose that St. John records it as confirming the truth of the remarks of the Pharisees to one another, "Behold, the world is gone after him."

"Certain Greeks"—*i.e.*, not Hellenists, but Gentiles, as the Eunuch of Candace, who came up periodically to worship.

21. "The same came therefore to Philip." Why did they accost this Apostle? Probably because he had a Greek name, and so, whether with reason or not, they might suppose him to be more connected with the outer Gentile world. It is remarkable that

22 Philip cometh and telleth Andrew: and again Andrew and Philip tell Jesus.

23 ¶ And Jesus answered them, saying, [x] The hour is come, that the Son of man should be glorified.

[x] ch. xiii. 32. & xvii. 1.

---

22. "And again Andrew and Philip tell Jesus." A., B., L., old Latin (a) read, "Andrew cometh and Philip, and they tell Jesus" But later Uncials, all Cursives, most old Latin, Vulg. and Syriac read as in Text. Recep.

Philip and Andrew, who intervened in this matter, are the only Apostles who have Greek names.

"We would see Jesus." See Him so as to have an interview with Him.

22. "Philip cometh and telleth Andrew," &c. Why this seeming difficulty about so plain a matter as introducing Gentile inquirers into the presence of the Son of Man? It is supposed that they recollected the Lord's words, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles" (Matth. x. 5); or, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." There certainly would not have been this hesitation if the Lord had at all fully made known to the Apostles His designs respecting the Gentiles. Very probably such an announcement would have been more likely to shake their faith than any revelation of the supernatural conceivable.

23. "And Jesus answered them, saying, The hour is come, that the Son of man," &c. He answered, apparently, not the Greeks, but the Apostles. The answer would have been unintelligible to the Greeks, who very probably were received by Him afterwards. They certainly do not seem to have accompanied Andrew and Philip into the presence of Jesus, and so could not have heard this answer. The Lord discerns by this coming of the Gentiles to His Light that the hour of Redemption, through His Cross and Death, was now come. Now He should be glorified as the Son of Man, by being declared to be the Son of God with power by the Resurrection of the Dead. These Greeks were the first fruits of the vast harvest to be gathered in shortly. They were the precursors of Cornelius, of the Philippian Jailer, of the Churches of Ephesus, Corinth, and Rome. But how was this mighty result to be brought about? What was the seed of such a harvest? His own Body surrendered in death.

24. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall

24 Verily, verily, I say unto you, [y]Except a corn of wheat
[y] 1 Cor. xv. 36. fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone:
but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.

[z] Matt. x. 39. & xvi. 25. Mark viii. 35. Luke ix. 24. & xvii. 33. 25 [z]He that loveth his life shall lose it; and
he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it
unto life eternal.

---

25. "Shall lose." ℵ, B., L., with a Cursive or two, read "loses;" but A., D., and all later Uncials, other Cursives, and versions read, "shall lose."

into the ground and die, it abideth alone," &c. As long as the grain is unsown, *i.e.*, till it falls and is covered by the earth, and as a particular single grain perishes, it abideth alone; but if it is sown and buried in suitable ground, then it begins to germinate; the integuments, which enfold and protect the infinitesimal germ of life which exists in every seed, perish, and become the nourishment of the new plant which springs from the now dead seed; so that it dies for the reproduction of a far more abundant life. This is an image setting forth the abundant Life of the Church through the Lord's Death. The Lord was absolutely alone—not a soul, even amongst His Apostles, understood His designs, much less could they then take up and continue His work. But if He died and was buried then that Death and Burial would be the prelude to His rising again in a new and glorified Body, and His whole nature, Body, Soul, and Spirit, would be the fountain of new Life to myriads.

And all this would be the fruit, not so much of His physical Death and Burial, but of the spirit of obedience and submission to His Father's Will, which prompted and inspired Him to endure it all. He was the exemplification, in His own Person, of the law which He had laid down for all His followers which He now enunciates.

25. "He that loveth his life shall lose it [or loseth it], and he that," &c. I have remarked on this in commenting on St. Matthew x. 39. Christ did not lay this down as the law for His people without Himself submitting to it with a perfection of self-devotion to which none of them can come near. It is a law which has many applications. I will give one from a well-known writer: "What He says of natural death may be applied to spiritual mortification: in which case we shall understand Him as laying it down as a general rule of God's dealings, that whosoever desires to bear much fruit

26 If any man serve me, let him follow me; and [a] where I am, there shall also my servant be: if any man serve me, him will *my* Father honour.

[a] ch. xiv. 3. & xvii. 24. 1 Thess. iv. 17.

---

unto God, that is, to be the means of bringing the souls of others to the truth and obedience of Christ, must become, in a spiritual sense, dead; he must die to the world and to himself, if he desire to be the source of life to others. The life and growth of the Kingdom of Heaven upon earth has been the reward of the daily death of Christ's faithful servants."

Godet has a very ingenious application of the Lord's words, assuming that the Greeks were present, and that He desired to address Himself to their way of viewing moral and spiritual matters: "All that is not given to God by an act of voluntary immolation bears within it the germ of death. Hence suppose that Jesus, seeking only His personal safety, had now gone to the Greeks to play among them the part of a sage, or to organize the State, like another Solon. He might, indeed, thus have saved His life, but would in reality have lost it. Not having given it up to God, He would not have received it from Him glorified (verse 23). Thus kept by Him it would have remained doomed to sterility and earthly frailty. It was by renouncing the part of a sage that He became a Christ: by renouncing the throne of a Solomon that He obtained that of God. Lange, with much depth of perception, points out that this saying included the judgment of Hellenism: for what was Greek civilization but human life cultivated from the view-point of enjoyment, and withdrawn from the Law of Sacrifice?"

26. "If any man serve me, let him follow me; and where I am, there shall," &c. This is the application to His people of that principle of self-sacrifice of which, in the previous verse, the Lord set Himself forth as the example. "If any man serve Me, he must be prepared to serve Me by following Me in the matter of not loving life, but hating it. He must not count his life dear unto himself. He must follow Me to prison and to death, if I call upon him so to suffer; but at least he must follow Me in the path of labour and self-denial, and if he so follow Me, then where I am he shall be also; he shall have no small reward, but one in My presence, beholding My glory, and this will be conferred upon him not by Myself only, but by My Father. As we are One, and act as One in all

27 [b] Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour: [c] but for this cause came I unto this hour.

28 Father, glorify thy name. [d] Then came there a voice from heaven, *saying,* I have both glorified *it,* and will glorify *it* again.

[b] Matt. xxvi. 38, 39. Luke xii. 50. ch. xiii. 21.
[c] Luke xxii. 53. ch. xviii. 37.
[d] Matt. iii. 17.

---

27. The place of the note of interrogation doubtful. See in notes below.

things, in working (ch. v. 17, xiv. 10), in judging (ch. v. 30), in witnessing (ch. v. 31, 32, 37), so in this matter of the honouring of My servants, the Father and Myself will be as One in honouring them."

27. St. John gives no account of the Agony; but in this verse we have a forecast, indeed more than a forecast of it. It seems to show that as the time of His Passion drew nearer, that fearful conflict between the human and the Divine Will was also going on in the breast of the Son of Man. We have all the parts or features of the Agony. "Now is my soul troubled" answers to "My soul is exceeding sorrowful;" "Father, save me from this hour" [whether suggested to His mind as a possible, or said as an actual prayer, matters not], answers to "Let this cup pass from Me;" "For this cause came I to this hour, Father glorify thy name," corresponds to "Nevertheless, not my will, but thine be done."

"Father, save me from this hour." This may be taken as if He said, "What shall I say? (I will say) Father save Me from this hour," or as if He said [what] "shall I say, Father save Me from this hour?" As if there was a struggle within Him as to what He should say.

"For this cause came I unto this hour." The Lord came into the world not only to teach by His example, but to reconcile the world to God by His Death. For this cause the Father had protected Him hitherto, so that though the Jews had so often sought to slay Him, yet He had always escaped out of their hands. It was even for this that He came in the flesh, that He might have a perfect human nature in which to suffer for sin.

28. "Father, glorify thy name." This is the expression of His perfect resignation as the Son of Man, and of His oneness in will with His Father as the Son of God; though the glory of the Father was to be through the Son's being "lifted up."

"Then came there a voice from heaven, saying, I have both

29 The people therefore, that stood by, and heard *it*, said that it thundered: others said, An angel spake to him.

30 Jesus answered and said, [e] This voice came not because of me, but for your sakes.

[e] ch. xi. 42.

31. Now is the judgment of this world: now shall [f] the prince of this world be cast out.

[f] Matt. xii. 29. Luke x. 18. ch. xiv. 30. & xvi. 11. Acts xxvi. 18. 2 Cor. iv. 4. Eph. ii. 2. & vi. 12.

---

glorified," &c. The Father glorified it in all the witness He had hitherto borne to His Son.

"And will glorify it again." When He shall rise from the dead, and when, through the preaching of His Gospel, God's name shall be great among the Gentiles. (Mal. ii.)

29. "The people therefore, that stood by, and heard it," &c. Some heard no articulate voice: others discerned the words, and thought that an angel spake. But evidently there were those who heard and understood the words of the voice, or the Lord would not have said,

30. "This voice came not because of me, but for your sakes." "To encourage you to continue in your faith in Me, even though for a short time I may appear forsaken even by God."

31. "Now is the judgment of this world." It was the whole world—religious, social, and political—through the chief priests, the voices of the multitude, the decision of Pilate, which condemned Christ to the Cross, and so pronounced its own condemnation. By the killing of the Just One, it proclaimed itself to be utterly unjust. But further. By the Cross of Jesus, the standard of the world, according to which it judges of things, is condemned and reversed. The world judges physical strength, popularity, self-assertion, wealth, and such things to be power. But Jesus on the Cross conquered by weakness, by rejection and reproach, by self-abnegation, by endurance.

"Now shall the prince of this world be cast out." This may mean cast out of the pre-eminence which he enjoyed in the heathen world. There is a change of tense to be noted, "Now is the judgment of this world: now *shall* the prince of this world be cast out." And yet Satan seems to hold absolute sway over above half the world, and even in Christian countries, and churches, and societies.

32 And I, [g] if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw [h] all *men* unto me.

33 [i] This he said, signifying what death he should die.

34 The people answered him, [k] We have heard out of the law that Christ abideth for ever: and

[g] ch. iii. 14. & viii. 28.
[h] Rom. v. 18. Heb. ii. 9.
[i] ch. xviii. 32.
[k] Ps. lxxxix. 36, 37. & cx. 4. Is. ix. 7. & liii. 8. Ezek. xxxvii. 25. Dan. ii. 44. & vii. 14, 27. Mic. iv. 7.

---

and families, he makes his power felt. In this present state of things he returns and reconquers nations who once formally disowned him. Witness the triumphs of Islamism, and the declensions of churches, and the rapid spread of atheism and heresy in societies once Christian. But the Lord, Who sees the end from the beginning, and to Whom a thousand years is but as a day, sees him dethroned and deprived of his power, and cast out finally.

It may be also that the Lord refers to that event in the unseen world of which we have a glimpse in Rev. xii. 9-12, in which it appears that Satan had a place in heaven as the accuser, from which he is cast forth, and his place taken by an Intercessor.

32. "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." This can scarcely mean all absolutely, because, as far as we can gather from the Scriptures, the Lord draws those only who hear the Gospel and obey its call; and even to this day there are tracts to which the sound of the Gospel has not penetrated. But there is a sense in which, in consequence of His Crucifixion, all, without exception, will be drawn. He will draw those whom He wills to save in mercy, and His voice will draw forth all that are in their graves for the final retribution.

33. "This he said, signifying what death he should die." The Death on the Cross was the lifting up to which the Ascension was the necessary sequel. The "lifting up" upon the Cross must not be taken to mean the physical lifting up a very short space above the ground. It rather looks to this, that from the moment of His Crucifixion His work was in a sphere above this world. It was no longer earthly, but heavenly. He never descended from the Cross to preach, or to heal, or to engage in conflict with evil, as He had done before. In His view of things the two liftings up are as one.

34. "The people answered him, We have heard out of the law

how sayest thou, The Son of man must be lifted up? who is this Son of man?

35 Then Jesus said unto them, Yet a little while [l] is the light with you. [m] Walk while ye have the light, lest darkness come upon you: for [n] he that walketh in darkness knoweth not whither he goeth.

36 While ye have light, believe in the light, that ye may be [o] the children of light. These

[l] ch. i. 9. & viii. 12. & ix. 5. ver. 46.
[m] Jer. xiii. 16. Eph. v. 8.
[n] ch. xi. 10. 1 John ii. 11.
[o] Luke xvi. 8 Eph. v. 8. 1 Thess. v. 5. 1 John ii. 9, 10, 11.

---

35. "Walk while." A., B., D., K., L., and three or four Cursives read, "according as;" ℵ, the later Uncials, almost all Cursives, Vulg., and Syriac read as in Received Text.

36. "The children;" rather, "the sons of light."

that Christ," &c. The people evidently understood the lifting up in the sense of being removed out of the world by death, and probably the Death of the Cross. They asked naturally—naturally, that is, in accordance with their views of the reign of the Messiah—"We have heard out of the law that Christ abideth for ever." This they gathered from such places as "Of the increase of his government and dominion there shall be no end."

"Who is this Son of man?" The people could not have asked this unless they connected the title, Son of Man, used as our Lord used it, with the Messiah. In the vernacular Syriac the name "son of man" is applied to any human being, and it is so used in some places in the Old Testament, but it had undoubtedly a Messianic sense, and our Lord evidently so used it as to lead them to apply it to Himself with a far higher meaning than the common one. The term "Son of God" has similar gradations of meaning. It may be simply an Israelite, or one who believes in and loves God, or an angel of God, or the Only Begotten Son. It is to be noticed, however, that the Evangelist does not record that our Lord applies to Himself the title "Son of Man." It is possible that the question of the Jews is grounded on a reminiscence of the words in chap. viii.: "When ye have lifted up the Son of Man, ye shall know that I am he."

35, 36. "Then Jesus said unto them, Yet a little while is the light with you . . . that ye may be the children of light." It is to be remarked that the Lord does not directly answer their question, just as in chap. viii. 24, when they asked, "Who art thou?" He

things spake Jesus, and departed, and [p] did hide himself from them.

[p] ch. viii. 59. & xi. 54.

---

only deigned to say, "The same that I said unto you from the beginning." He could not have answered them by explaining to them the transcendent sense in which He was the Son of Man, as the New or Second Adam, the representative and sponsor of all humanity; for this is one of the deepest things in His Revelation, and they must learn much more and believe much more before they could enter into it. Neither could He tell them that He was the Son of Man, as meaning the Messiah, for they utterly repudiated the true idea of the Messiah. He simply reasserts Himself to be the Light, and that He will be this Light to them for a very short time, so they must walk according to Him as the Light, lest darkness come upon them.

What, however, does the Lord mean by this "little while?" It can scarcely be the two or three days before His Crucifixion. It looks rather to the day of grace which will really begin by the descent of the Spirit, but which will be to them a very short period compared with the many centuries during which they and their fathers possessed the Law of God and the knowledge of His will. We know that they rejected this last opportunity, and so darkness came upon them. They were shut up to judicial unbelief and blindness ["Blindness in part has happened unto Israel"].

These were the parting words of Christ. They seem an exhortation to accept Him, and walk in Him, not only during the few hours before He was crucified, but during the day of grace which would be opened by His departure. Then one who spake in His Name said, perhaps to some of these very men, "Unto you God, having raised up His Son Jesus, sent Him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." (Acts iii. 26.)

36. "While ye have light, believe in the light." "Believe that I am the true Light, that in Me ye can see God, that ye may be the children [or sons] of light. Just as the children of God are those who believe in and obey God, so the children of light are those who have the light and walk in it, and according to it."

"These things spake Jesus, and departed," &c. Most probably He perceived the anger which His words respecting Himself being the true Light was exciting within them, and as He was only to

37 ¶ But though he had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him:

suffer at the very hour of the Passover. He again removed Himself out of their reach till He was betrayed.

37-41. The key to the understanding of these difficult verses is the assertion in the first, where it is said that the Jews did not believe, notwithstanding the number and greatness of the Lord's miracles. Was it not fatal to His pretensions to be the Messiah if the people of God, to whom He was sent, rejected Him? No; the Evangelist answers. It was written in prophecy that they both would not, and could not believe.

We shall have to consider, at some little length, what was the place and function of miracles in the Mission of Jesus. It may be said with truth that He performed His miracles to draw attention to His claims, but they had a deeper purpose, which was, to convince those that were "of God" and "so heard the words of God" that Jesus was "from God" and that all He said must be believed. The following will serve to show this.

The Lord uttered such words as "Blessed are the meek, the merciful, the pure in heart; when ye give alms, or pray, or fast, be not as the hypocrites," and many like them. Anyone who was of God would be attracted by such sayings. He would feel that the Great Teacher put old truths in a new light and with a new force. But the Lord said other things of a far more startling character. He said, "Whatsoever things the Father doeth, the same doeth the Son likewise." "As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." "I am the Resurrection and the Life." "The bread that I will give is my flesh." Now has a man who has power to put moral truths in a new and powerful way, on that account a right to say, "I am the Living Bread," or "I am the Resurrection and the Life"? Assuredly not. But the Lord did say these startling things of Himself, and many more. We can then imagine an honest-minded Jew saying, "I can hear this man and accept what He says, when He tells us that we must be pure, and merciful, and peacemaking, but I cannot listen to Him when He says, 'I am the Living Bread,' or 'I am the Resurrection and the Life.'" But to this his wiser neighbour might reply, "You stumble at this Man saying, 'I am the Living Bread,' but have you considered that this Man has fed five thousand

38 That the saying of Esaias the prophet might be fulfilled, which he spake, [q] Lord, who hath believed our report? and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed?

q Is. liii. 1. Rom. x. 16.

39 Therefore they could not believe, because that Esaias said again,

---

men with five loaves? You stumble at His saying, 'I am the Resurrection,' but you do not consider that He has just raised from the grave a man who had been dead four days." If the Jew said, "I cannot but think it blasphemy that a man should say such things of himself," it might be rejoined, that quite as great things are said of the Messiah, Whom all the most godly Jews were then expecting, that He is "the Lord of David," sitting at God's right hand—that He is to be the "Lord our Righteousness," —that He is "God with us,"—and that "His goings forth have been from of old, of everlasting." If the Jew again retorted, "Why should all this be? Is not a teaching prophet all that we require?" it would be rejoined, "No, our nation and our race require much more than a prophet or a teacher. We require a Redeemer to free us from the slavery of sin. We require a New Man to be a new source of life to us; we require not only teaching, but power to obey that teaching, and all this will necessitate a revelation of the arm of the Lord such as you little dream of." Such reasoning may serve to show that miracles were required to convince and retain those who were of God; but there is a fearful converse of all this. The same miracle which may serve to convince and retain the Jew who is "of God," hardens against Jesus those who are "not of God." But the hardening by the miracle is not the first hardening. They have already hardened themselves. They have hardened themselves against the teaching of Moses and the Prophets, when that teaching, if received, would have convinced them of sin, and humbled them before God in repentance, and now such a miracle as the resurrection of a dead body cannot move them except to greater hatred of the Person and Message of Him Who has raised the dead. And this hardening effect of the miracles was, on account of the moral degradation into which they had then sunk, by far the most general effect, especially amongst the higher classes.

Now this hardening God both foresaw and foretold. Such a

40 [r] He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart; that they should not see with *their* eyes, nor understand with *their* heart, and be converted, and I should heal them.

[r] Is. vi. 9, 10. Matt. xiii. 14.

---

portentous thing as the national rejection of the Messiah, coming with such credentials, by the then people of God, would have been, humanly speaking, fatal to His claims, if it had not been foretold; but it was foretold, and besides this, it was no new thing in their history. There had been a rehearsal of it, as it were, in the days of Isaiah. He, too, had been sent to the same people with the same message of righteousness. In despair he was compelled to say, "Who hath believed our report?" but he had himself been shown the reason for the rejection of his message, for the Lord had appeared to him in the temple, and sent him to do nothing less than harden the people by the message he was to deliver to them. The message of Isaiah was to have the same effect as the miracles of the Lord. It was to harden the mass, but to save the remnant. And in this it effected God's purpose. The mass was worthless, but the remnant, though it was but a tenth, was to be the nucleus of a new and better state. The Holy Seed was the substance (Isaiah vi. 13).

The Evangelist adopting the words of Isaiah, as true of the Jews of his day, cites him as saying, "Therefore they could not believe because Esaias said again, He hath blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts, that they should not see with their eyes . . . . and be converted, and I should heal them." Are we then to infer that God did not desire the conversion of the Jews? Impossible! He had sent John that all men through him might believe. But what was to be the foundation of their faith? Not mere intellectual belief, but repentance, forsaking of sin, and a sincere doing of their duty. (Luke iv. 10, 14.) God blinded their eyes, not to the moral teaching of the Lord, but to the significance of His Miracles. They themselves had blinded their own eyes to His moral teaching, and to the holiness of His Life and Character, and so God, in just punishment, did not allow the most stupendous signs to have the effect upon them which they might have had. But He did this, not by an arbitrary act, but according to the operation of a law—the law that a man's individual free will, as being good or evil, makes him accept or reject the claims of the truth.

41 [a] These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory, and
[a] Is. vi. 1. spake of him.

42 ¶ Nevertheless among the chief rulers also many be-
[b] ch. vii. 13. & ix. 22. lieved on him; but [b] because of the Pharisees they did not confess *him*, lest they should be put out of the synagogue:

It would have, humanly speaking, destroyed Christianity from the very first, if the whole body of the Jewish people, in their then state, had intellectually accepted the claims of Christ, and crowded into the Church. As Godet very pertinently remarks, "We have only to remember their contentions with St. Paul to perceive what an insurmountable obstacle would have been placed in the way of the mission to the Gentiles by the entrance of the bulk of a carnal, legal, and Pharisaic Israel into the Church."

But, after all, is there not some harshness in all this? There may be, if we consider the state of each individual Jew who rejected Jesus before His Crucifixion and Ascension as irrevocable; but even such a predestinarian expositor as Augustine writes upon this verse: "Hence also those could not believe: not that men cannot be changed to the better; but that, as long as they are thus, they cannot believe."

41. "These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory, and spake of him." No doubt the Evangelist means, not the glory of God the Father, but the glory of the Son in His pre-existing state: the Evangelist cites Esaias as speaking of Christ; and here he declares that the prophet saw the glory of Him of Whom he was speaking, *i.e.*, of the Lord, the Son, sitting in the temple upon a throne, high and lifted up, receiving the worship of the Seraphim. A more remarkable declaration of the Godhead of the Son can hardly be conceived.

42. "Nevertheless among the chief rulers . . . . put out of the synagogue." This shows the evil power of party. The chief rulers were the legally appointed rulers. The Pharisees were a sect or party, and so self-constituted; and yet, by their self-assertion, and pretensions, and united action, they cowed the chief rulers, and prevented them from confessing what they believed. This place, amongst many others in this Gospel—indeed, throughout the Scriptures—shows the weak and unsatisfactory nature of human faith.

43 [u] For they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God.

[u] ch. v. 44.

44 ¶ Jesus cried and said, [x] He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me.

[x] Mark ix. 37. 1 Pet. i. 21.

45 And [y] he that seeth me seeth him that sent me.

[y] ch. xiv. 9.

46 [z] I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me should not abide in darkness.

[z] ver. 35, 36. ch. iii. 19. & viii. 12. & ix. 5, 39.

We shall have to take notice of it when showing what is the real teaching of this Gospel respecting faith.

44-50. There can be little doubt but that we have here a summary of the Lord's teachings, given by the Evangelist, mostly, if not entirely, in the Lord's own words, and for the purpose of showing that in no way whatsoever, either in asking men to believe in Himself, or in setting Himself forth as the Light of the world, or as the Judge of all men, or in His teaching and preaching, was the Son apart from, or independent of, His Father. This abstract, then, of His teaching is His vindication and, consequently, the condemnation of the Jews.

44. "He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me." "Do I ask men to believe in Me as the Son of God? The very idea of 'Son' carries the thought back to the Father. Do I ask men to believe in Me as the Sent? The very idea of one Sent fixes the idea on the Sender. Do I ask them to believe on Me as the Messiah or Anointed? That of necessity requires that they should believe on Him Who anointed or sanctified Me, and His purpose in so doing."

45. "He that seeth me seeth him that sent me." Here is an advance on the preceding. "Is belief consummated in spiritual vision, so that even here faith becomes inward sight? Then he who thus sees Me sees Him that sent Me, for We are One: One in goodness, grace, power, love, wisdom, as well as One in Essence."

46. "I am come a light unto the world," &c. This also, I think, if taken in connection with the rest of this short discourse, must be taken with reference to the Father. The Father is Light, but He

47 And if any man hear my words, and believe not, [a] I judge him not: for [b] I came not to judge the world, but to save the world.

48 [c] He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: [d] the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day.

49 For [e] I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, [f] what I should say, and what I should speak.

a ch. v. 45. & viii. 15, 26.
b ch. iii. 17.
c Luke x. 16.
d Deut. xviii. 19. Mark xvi. 16.
e ch. viii. 38. & xiv. 10.
f Deut. xviii. 18.

---

47. "Believe not." א, A., B., D., L., Vulg., Peshito, and old Latin read "keep not."

is the Light which no man can approach unto. In Christ alone we see His Light—the Light of His holy character, of His wisdom, and of His truth. So that no one can walk in the Light of God, except he walks in the Light of the Revelation of the Son of God.

47-48. "And if any man hear my words, and believe not . . . last day." Here the Lord, in mercy to men's souls, reveals the fearful converse. He came not to judge, but to save; but yet His Word judges, both now and at the last day: for His Word is the Word of God. He hath not spoken of Himself; every word that He spoke was ordained in the counsels of the Father; and so His Word, as He had said before, tries men, whether they are of God or not (chap. viii. 47). This word separates between men even now—tries them, sifts them, brings out their characters,—and at the last day the Lord, to Whom the Father has committed all judgment, will make good that award which His Word, being the Word of the Father, has already made.

49. "For I have not spoken of myself . . . . what I should speak." This is apparently the one view which the Lord desires that all men who heard Him should have—that in His wondrous words there is nothing of His own, nothing, if one may so say, original, as being His, apart from His Father. Looked at from our point of view, never were words so original as the words of Christ. Even infidels, in commenting upon them, have said that, in the sayings of Jesus, there is that which is absolutely new; but

50 And I know that his commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak.

---

that originality which good men very rightly ascribe to Him, He here repudiates, and refers all He has and all He knows to the Fountain of Deity, the Father.

50. "I know that his commandment is life everlasting." Is this said with reference to Himself or to us? Of course, God's commandments are life everlasting to us His creatures; but the Lord had been just speaking of His Father having given Him a commandment, "what to say, and what to teach." Now, if all He said was commanded by the Father, some of the things which that Father had commanded Him to say were things which would inevitably bring about His Crucifixion. And yet, in perfect trust that His Father would support Him through that Crucifixion, and bring Him back to life, He said all, knowing that the everlasting life of His people would be the result of His obedience unto death.

CHAP. XIII.

NOW [a] before the feast of the passover, when Jesus knew that [b] his hour was come that he should depart out of this world unto the Father, having

[a] Matt. xxvi. 2.
[b] ch. xii. 23. & xvii. 1, 11.

---

1. "When Jesus knew;" rather, "Jesus knowing." So Alford and Revisers, and Vulg., *sciens*.

1. "Now before the feast of the passover." The time indicated by the Evangelist in this verse depends upon the time when he considered this feast of the Passover to have taken place. For St. John evidently holds that the evening of the Lord's Crucifixion was the Passover time, *i.e.*, the legal time; so that if our Lord kept a Passover, which according to the Synoptics He unquestionably did, He must have anticipated the legal time by twenty-four hours.

loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end.

---

1. "Unto the end." So Alford and Revisers; but latter in margin translate "to the uttermost."

In all probability He did this in order that, as the true Paschal Victim, He might be crucified at the time when the typical victim was slain. So that "before the feast of the Passover" might mean any time before the Friday evening; but inasmuch as the events we are now about to consider (particularly those with reference to Judas) took place at the time when the Lord ate His Passover Feast, the Evangelist means by "before the feast of the Passover," the Thursday evening.

"When Jesus knew that his hour was come that he should depart," &c. Some think this to be written with especial reference to "his own which were in the world." He was going to the Father and leaving them, and yet the thoughts of His own departure and His welcome back by the Father did not, in the least degree, make Him forget them. He loved those whom He was leaving to the end with undiminished love: and so at this very supper He instituted that Holy Mystery which would be a perpetual pledge of His love, because a perpetual pledge of His Presence, and a means by which He might ever dwell in them.

Some think that "unto the end" means "to the uttermost," as in 1 Thess. ii. 16, and that this was shown by His voluntary humiliation in stooping to wash their feet; and no doubt this sign of love must be included. But the institution of the Eucharist being the institution of a permanent means of grace, in which He condescends in the lowly elements of bread and wine to feed them with Himself as the Bread of Life, seems by far the greater pledge of love. And we shall presently see that the one has no obscure bearing on the other.

The mention of the Passover as closely connected with the time when He should "pass" out of this world cannot be considered as fortuitous. Augustine says "That prophetical figure is fulfilled in the truth where Christ is led as a sheep to be immolated, with whose Blood our door-posts being marked, *i.e.*, our foreheads signed with the sign of the Cross, we are delivered from the perdition of this world as from an Egyptian captivity or destruction, and make a most salutary transition when from the devil we pass

2 And supper being ended, [c]the devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's *son*, to betray him;

3 Jesus knowing [d]that the Father had given all things into his hands, and [e]that he was come from God, and went to God;

4 [f]He riseth from supper, and laid aside his garments; and took a towel, and girded himself.

c Luke xxii. 3. ver. 27.

d Matt. xi. 27. & xxviii. 18. ch. iii. 35. & xvii. 2. Acts ii. 36. 1 Cor. xv. 27. Heb. ii. 8.

e ch. viii. 42. & xvi. 28.

f Luke xxii. 27. Phil. ii. 7, 8.

---

2. "Supper being ended;" rather, "when supper was begun"—perhaps with the meaning of being ready or being laid, but the past participle (γενομένου) need not mean that supper was finished.

"The devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray Him." ℵ, B., L., and Vulg. read, "Having now put into the heart that Judas Iscariot should betray Him." *Misisset in cor ut traderet eum Judas, &c.*, Vulg., but A., D., old Latin, most Uncials, Cursives, and Versions read as in the received Text.

over into Christ, and from this unstable world to His most surely founded kingdom."

2. "Supper being ended." This is a wrong translation, and introduces much confusion. It should be rendered, "supper being made," or "when supper was begun."

"The devil having now put it into the heart of Judas," &c. Whatever be the reading, this is the only possible meaning. This notice of Judas, as having been already inspired by Satan to betray Him, seems to be mentioned in order to enhance the greatness of the humiliation which succeeds, in that He washed even the traitor's feet, or it may be noticed to preface the words, "Ye are clean, but not all."

3. "Jesus knowing that the Father," &c. This may be paraphrased: "Jesus, with the full consciousness of His own infinite power and dignity, that He had all power in heaven and in earth, that He was come from God as being His only-begotten Son, and went to God to receive the glory which He had with Him before the world was: having all this perfectly in His consciousness, He humbled Himself to be amongst them as one that serveth."

4. "He riseth from supper," &c. See how each step of this act of infinite condescension is dwelt upon by one who had, in astonishment, witnessed it all. He riseth from supper; that, no doubt, drew all eyes upon Himself, as to the purpose for which He interrupted

5 After that he poureth water into a bason, and began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe *them* with the towel wherewith he was girded.

† Gr. *he.* 6 Then cometh he to Simon Peter: and † Peter

---

5. "A bason." Literally, "*the* bason," as it was usual to provide one for the purpose.

the sacred meal; He laid aside His garments, took the towel, girded Himself, filled the bason with water. "It was not before reclining, but after they had all sat down, that He arose. In the next place: He doth not merely wash them, but doth so, putting off His garments; and He did not even stop there, but girded Himself with a towel. Nor was He satisfied with this, but Himself filled the bason, and did not bid another fill it." (Chrysostom.) All this must have taken place after the dispute about pre-eminence. It is difficult to imagine that the Lord's example should have been so utterly thrown away upon them as that after such a scene they should have had a strife among themselves which should be the greatest.

6. "Then cometh he to Simon Peter, and Peter saith unto him," &c. Some, amongst them, Chrysostom, think that He came to the traitor first, who submitted to be washed without a word; then He came to Peter, and the others were instructed from his case. It is very probable that He came first to Peter, not because of his primacy, but because He foresaw that his reception of the act would afford the best opportunity for teaching the needful lesson.

"Lord, dost thou wash my feet? . . . . What I do thou knowest not now . . . . If I wash thee not," &c. For what purpose did the Lord perform this act of humiliation? Was its significance exhausted when He had set them this example of self-abnegation, and reproved their pride and self-seeking? We cannot think so. In such a case "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part in me," means, "If thou dost not, when I am gone, follow my example, and do to thy brethren as I have done to thee, thou hast no part in me." But this significance, though, of course, true, cannot be what the Lord means, for the Lord in these words evidently requires of Peter not merely a future following of His example, but a present reception of an act of condescension on His part which if Peter did not there and then receive, he would have no part in Christ. But, on the other hand, it is impossible to suppose that our Lord by the outward act would impart to the Apostles some mere outward clean-

saith unto him, Lord, [g] dost thou wash my feet?

[g] See Matt. iii. 14.

sing analogous to the purification by a Jewish ablution. There can be no doubt that the act was sacramental in its nature—not sacramental, of course, so that it should be a standing ordinance in the Church, but still sacramental so far as the Apostles were concerned, so that the Lord should there and then impart to them an inward grace through an outward sign. They had believed in Christ as the Son of God, they loved Him, they had given up all for Him, and so, compared with others, they were "clean;" but there was a spiritual cleansing which they yet required (perhaps from ambition, self-seeking, desiring to be the greatest), and it was the Lord's design to impart this cleansing to them simultaneously with their reception of this outward act. Believing Him to be the Son of God, their preparation of spirit to receive this particular spiritual cleansing was the devout and humble reception on their part of this act of condescending love, consciously believing that it was the humiliation of One infinitely greater than themselves, and was needful to them, if they would have part in Him. Judas received it in stolid indifference and unbelief, and was not cleansed because he received the outward sign unworthily. Peter was in danger of losing it because, out of mistaken humility, he at first shrunk from receiving the outward sign.

There are two ways in which an outward act of condescension from one greatly our superior may be received. We may put it from us altogether, and not allow the superior to abase himself; but in this case we put ourselves above him. We presume to judge him, and to pronounce that the act is unworthy of him: but in this we judge and condemn ourselves, for we show that we do not understand in what true worthiness consists, for the action *is* worthy, and the higher in the scale of being the superior is, the more worthy it is. In God Himself supreme dignity and supreme condescension meet. He is the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, and yet He carefully ministers to the wants of the lowest and meanest of His creatures. The other way, of course, is to receive the act of abasement, whatever it be, with humility and thankfulness, acknowledging that the superior knows best what is for his own dignity and our well-being.

It must suggest itself to the believing mind that the action of the Lord has some reference to the Sacrament which was instituted at

7 Jesus answered and said unto him, What I do thou
h ver. 12. knowest not now; h but thou shalt know hereafter
8 Peter saith unto him, Thou shalt never wash my feet.
i ch. iii. 5. 1 Cor. vi. 11. Eph. v. 26. Titus iii. 5. Heb. x. 22. Jesus answered him, i If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me.

---

that very time. If Christ, in any real way, gives Himself in that Sacrament, it must be an act of the greatest condescension on His part, for it is the Living Bread offering the lower part of His Nature, His Flesh and Blood, to be fed upon by us under earthly elements. Out of a false humility we may refuse the mystery. We may say, in effect, "Lord, Thou shalt never give me Thy Body and Blood. It is unworthy of Thee to give Thyself in Thy Body and Blood. I am willing to receive Thee intellectually, but I cannot believe in the reality of Thy condescension to feed me with Thyself after such a sort." To which the Lord may answer: "Thou knowest not the deep needs of thy nature. Thou knowest not how low I must descend to feed thee; but though thou knowest not now, yet if thou believest and obeyest, thou shalt know hereafter."

In this way we see how this incident falls in with what I have frequently drawn attention to as one of the purposes of this Gospel, viz., to teach us implicit faith—faith which not only adores the greatness of the Son of God, but the greatness and reality of His condescension, in that He washes us with His own hands, and feeds us with His own Flesh.

Such is the lesson of the act taken as a whole, but each word of the Son of God teaches us some deep lesson.

"What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter." Was this fulfilled when the Lord, in verses 14 and 15, explained to them the significance of the example He had set? We think not. Peter realized afterwards, as he could not then, His Master's Divine Dignity and his own needs, and how this act of condescending love had in some mysterious way met and supplied those needs. All God's dealings with us now are acts of loving condescension on His part which, at the best, we know very imperfectly, but if we continue in the fellowship of His Son we shall hereafter understand more perfectly.

8. "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me." Some take upon themselves to say that "no part with Me" does not mean no

9 Simon Peter saith unto him, Lord, not my feet only, but also *my* hands and *my* head.

10. Jesus saith to him, He that is washed needeth not

---

10. "He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet." "He that hath been bathed hath no need save to wash his feet," &c. (Alford and Revisers).

part in My salvation, but no part in My work; but to say this seems very presumptuous, for how can any man say what would have been the issue of such disobedience persisted in? No pride of spirit (and pride of spirit is sinfulness of spirit) could have been greater.

9. "Simon Peter saith unto him, Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head." Notice not only the readiness of submission, but the enthusiasm of this Apostle when he discerned the determined will of the Lord.

It should be noticed here, that the shrinking of the Apostle was not a shrinking from a further spiritual cleansing. If it had been such—if he had shrunk from any further inward purifying, he would not have been a follower of the Lord at all. It was a drawing back from an outward act, and so a questioning of the Lord's wisdom, and if he discerned any spiritual purification in it, it was on his part an unsubmissiveness of spirit to receive the Lord's Blessing in the Lord's way.

10. "Jesus saith to him, He that is washed," &c. There is a general agreement about the meaning of this verse, which is obscured in the authorized translation by two different words in the Greek being translated by the same word in the English. It is, "He that is bathed needeth not save to wash his feet." "He that has had his whole body cleansed in the bath needs only to wash off from his feet the dust which from his walking in sandals on the dry roads adheres to them." And the spiritual meaning is, "He that has been once cleansed needs only to wash off by acts of repentance and confession the sins of infirmity into which he falls in the path of daily life." The application to the Apostles seems to be of this sort. By their acceptance of Christ and steadfast adherence to Him they were in a measure clean, but they had yet faults to be cleansed from; as, for instance, the desire of pre-eminence. It was from faults of this sort that this foot-washing by our Lord's hands was an outward cleansing typical of an inward one, and their humble and devout reception of it was the state of mind required on their part in order that it should not be to them a dead form.

save to wash *his* feet, but is clean every whit: and [k] ye are
[k] ch. xv. 3. clean, but not all.
[l] ch. vi. 64. 11 For [l] he knew who should betray him; therefore said he, Ye are not all clean.

12 So after he had washed their feet, and had taken his garments, and was set down again, he said unto them, Know ye what I have done to you?

"Ye are clean," ye the body of my disciples.

"But not all." Notice how He first pronounces the body or number of the apostles clean, and then makes the exception. So it is with the Church, the Lord's mystical Body. By virtue of union with Him, and the promise of the Spirit remaining in it, it is clean. It is the *Holy* Catholic Church, but notwithstanding its holiness, in it "the bad are ever mingled with the good."

11. "For he knew who should betray him: therefore said he, ye," &c. How constantly are we reminded that the Lord knew the traitor, though very probably he was the most fair-spoken of all. This repetition of such a thing is for two reasons. First, to show that the Lord with much long-suffering endured his presence, as He now permits for a season His Church to be defiled by the presence in it of evil men; and secondly, to be a warning to each soul that the Lord, the Great Shepherd, knows all of us, our most secret faults, and our most secret services. "I am he that searcheth the hearts and reins." So let us search our hearts to see if there be any root of bitterness in us. Let us "judge ourselves, that we be not judged of Him."

12. "So after he had washed their feet, and had taken his garments . . . Know ye what I have done to you?" Our Lord now sets forth the teaching significance of this act. By what He had done He had taught them the dignity of service—that no service done to others can demean the doer of it. On the contrary, the only real disgrace is idleness and pride. We are not, as I have said, to suppose that the teaching of the action was all, that there was no secret cleansing intended to accompany the outward sign. If there had not been some mysterious cleansing, He would not have made the difference between the rest and Judas, when He said, "Ye are clean, but not all." The sacraments of the Church, whilst they are channels of grace, are also precious means of instruction.

13 [m] Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for *so* I am.

14 [n] If I then, *your* Lord and Master, have washed your feet; [o] ye also ought to wash one another's feet.

15 For [p] I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you.

m Matt. xxiii. 8, 10. Luke vi. 46. 1 Cor. viii. 6. & xii. 3. Phil. ii. 11.
n Luke xxii. 27.
o Rom. xii. 10. Gal. vi. 1, 2. 1 Pet. v. 5.
p Matt. xi. 29. Phil. ii. 5. 1 Pet. ii. 21. 1 John ii. 6.

---

13. "Master"—in the sense of teacher (*didascalos*).

13. "Ye call me Master [Teacher] and Lord: and ye say well," &c. The higher the Lord's Dignity, the more impressive the lesson. They called Him Teacher and Lord, and He accepted this in words which are emphasized by a touch of irony, "Ye say well, for so I am." As if He said, "I am your Teacher and your Lord in a sense that none else can be, because your Divine Teacher and Lord."

14. "If I your Lord and Master . . . you should do as I have done to you." The action of the Lord has been imitated to the letter in many parts of Christendom. St. Augustine speaks in high commendation of many who in his time copied the Lord's act. Isaac Williams gives an instance in St. Louis, King of France, who not only did this himself, but urged this imitation of Christ upon some of the principal lords of his Court. The kings of England also went through some ceremony of the sort till the time of William III., but as Williams remarks: "The very nature of such an action is now changed, for such a practice is not usual amongst us as a servile office at all, as it then was, and therefore this, if literally performed, would not be the same in spirit and character. But doubtless other such bodily expressions of humility, which are of this character, are very profitable."

All mortifications of pride and self-consequence in doing good to others are in the spirit of the Lord's action. The high-born female who becomes for love of Christ and His poor a nursing sister, or a teacher of orphans, acts in the spirit of the Lord's deed. Many works of mercy, particularly visiting the sick and the prisoners, and instructing the ignorant, may be done and are done in the spirit of it. It is a notable fact in this our day that three Lord Chancellors of England in succession have been Sunday

16 [q] Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him.

[q] Matt. x. 24. Luke vi. 40. ch. xv. 20.

[r] James i. 25.

17 [r] If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them.

18 ¶ I speak not of you all: I know whom I have chosen:

School teachers of poor boys during a part, at least, of their term of office.

16, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater, &c. . . . do them." This is an oft-repeated saying of the Lord's. We have it substantially in Matth. x. 24, and Luke vi. 40, and also in this Gospel, prefaced with "Remember the word that I said unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord" (ch. xv. 20). But with apparently a somewhat different application in each case. Here it means: "You have seen Me stoop to do a menial service when I saw that it was needful for the salvation or perfection of souls, and ye must, in all your ministrations, act in the spirit of this My example. Ye are My servants, and ye must hold yourselves to be the servants of My flock, and, as I have done Myself, show by your demeanour that ye account that ye live for them, and not for yourselves."

17. "If ye know these things, happy are ye," &c. "Happy are ye, because ye show by your doing of them that ye have profited by My teaching, and have My Spirit dwelling in you. Happy too are ye, for if ye now, as far as ye are able, share My humiliation, ye shall hereafter partake of My glory."

Notice how the Lord here assumes the essential separation between knowledge and obedience unless united by grace. They are in two different spheres: the one in that of the intellect, the other in that of the will.

18. "I speak not of you all: I know whom I have chosen," &c. As if He said, "There is one among you who has so hardened himself that My words respecting humbling yourselves to do service to your brethren are totally inapplicable to him; for whilst sitting at meat with Me, he is plotting My destruction. I know the hearts of all of you whom I have chosen, and I know that by one of you is about to be fulfilled that saying of Scripture respecting the false and

but that the scripture may be fulfilled, [s]He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me.

[s] Ps. xli. 9. Matt. xxvi. 23. ver. 21.

19 [t]|| Now I tell you before it come, that, when it is come to pass, ye may believe that I am *he*.

[t] ch. xiv. 29. & xvi. 4. || Or, *From henceforth*.

---

18. "Eateth bread with me," or "my bread" (B., C., L.): but ℵ, A., D., Vulg., and old Latin agree with Rec. Text.

treacherous friend, 'He that eateth bread with Me (or My bread) hath lifted up his heel against me.'"

The words after "chosen" come in very abruptly and some sentence must be understood. From the analogy of similar places we should understand, "All this is done or takes place," &c.

Of course no intelligent reader can suppose that the wickedness of Judas was ordained by God, and so that Judas was made wicked by God. He, on the contrary, in spite of all the warnings of God through His Son, increased in wickedness, and persisted, for his own miserable purposes, in clinging to an office for which he knew full well that of all men living he was most unfit, and so he was allowed, as numbers of other men are, to work out his own sin. The sin which he had been secretly cherishing and indulging, had taken such hold upon him, that he was capable of betraying His Master and Friend. He was ready to do it, and what he was ready and willing to do, he was allowed to do, and God, Who knows beforehand all contingencies, caused his conduct to be foretold in the Scriptures, and the foretelling of it is appealed to by our Lord to confirm the faith of the Apostles. It is as if He said, "When you see one whom I have so long associated with Myself and with you, betraying Me, you may be shaken in your confidence in Me, and ask secretly, 'Can I have that unity of will and purpose with the Father if I have chosen such an one?' Yes, I have that unity. The Father gave him to Me in his then state of comparative innocence, and by the Father's direction I chose him. He has fallen since, and his fall and its consequences are foretold in Scripture by Him Who knows all things from the beginning: and so, that I should have such a false friend and companion is one proof of the truth of My mission."

20 [u] Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that receiveth whomsoever I send receiveth me; and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me.

21 [x] When Jesus had thus said, [y] he was troubled in spirit, and testified, and said, Verily, verily, I say unto you, that [z] one of you shall betray me.

22 Then the disciples looked one on another, doubting of whom he spake.

u Matt. x. 40. & xxv. 40. Luke x. 16.

x Matt. xxvi. 21. Mark xiv. 18. Luke xxii. 21.

y ch. xii. 27.

z Acts i. 17. 1 John ii. 19.

---

20. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that receiveth whomsoever," &c. The connection of this saying with what precedes it seems to be this. The Lord was speaking of the fall of an Apostle, and, human nature being as it is, his fall might be the precursor of that of many others who shared the same ministry of reconciliation. Were then the acts which he did in virtue of his Apostleship of no avail, and would the fall of others after him render their ministrations invalid? No. If, when he went about preaching, anyone had received even Judas in the name of Christ, he would have received Christ. Perhaps, also, as some think, the Lord here answers the misgivings of some among them that they could not be true Apostles if their company was polluted by the presence of a traitor. Anyhow, we get from this place the all-important inference that a sin of the deepest conceivable dye does not invalidate the ministry of one who is duly sent by Christ, or by His Church after His departure.

21. "When Jesus had thus said, he was troubled in spirit, and testified," &c. Troubled in spirit at the thought of the wickedness and ingratitude of Judas, and of the terrible doom awaiting him. This was intensified by the fact that it was "one of you."

22. "Then the disciples looked one upon another," &c. It is very remarkable that none of them appears to have thought of Judas. Neither in the accounts in the Synoptics nor in this, do they seem to have had the smallest suspicion respecting him. When we consider what his character really was, what consummate hypocrisy must he have practised to keep up the appearance of seriousness and sincerity, not to say of sanctity!

23. "Now there was leaning on Jesus' bosom," &c. For some time before this the Jews had adopted the custom of reclining at meals,

23 Now [a]there was leaning on Jesus' bosom one of his disciples, whom Jesus loved.

[a] ch. xix. 26. & xx. 2. & xxi. 7, 20, 24.

24 Simon Peter therefore beckoned to him, that he should ask who it should be of whom he spake.

25 He then lying on Jesus' breast saith unto him, Lord, who is it?

26 Jesus answered, He it is, to whom I shall give a

---

23. "Leaning;" rather, "reclining;" *recumbens* (Vulg.).

24. "That he should ask," &c. B., C., L., old Latin, Vulg. read, "And saith to him, say, who is it of whom He speaks?" *Et dixit ei: Quis est de quo dicit?* A., D., most Uncials, Cursives, and versions read as in Rec. Text.

25. "Lying on;" rather, "leaning back" (Alford and Revisers).

26. "To whom I shall give a sop when I have dipped it." So ℵ, A., D., most Uncials, Cursives, Vulg., and Syriac, &c. B., C., L. read, "For whom I shall dip the sop and give it him."

each person lying at full length on the couch and resting on his left side, so that the head of one would be close to the bosom of his left-hand neighbour. St. John occupied the place next to the Lord, as one whom He especially loved, and he could easily turn to the Lord and receive in a whisper the name of the traitor. Amongst the very numerous pictures of the Last Supper, there is, as far as I have seen, but one which aims at representing the scene correctly. This is one by N. Poussin in the Bridgwater Collection. Looking at this painting we instantly perceive how, by an almost imperceptible motion of the head, St. John could ask the name from the Lord.

24. "Simon Peter therefore beckoned to him." A probable reading is, "and saith to him (John), say who it is of whom He speaks." It agrees with the somewhat hasty character of Peter to assume that John already knew who was the traitor, but the reading in the Received Text is more in accordance with the fact of St. Peter beckoning, or making a sign which implies that he reclined too far off from St. John to speak to him. The reader will notice how none but an eye-witness could have given to us so circumstantial an account.

25. "Lying on Jesus' breast." Rather, "falling back" or "leaning back" on Jesus' breast, so as to be able to ask Him the question in a whisper.

26. "The sop." In the course of the Paschal Feast, the father

|| sop, when I have dipped *it*. And when he had dipped the
|| Or, *morsel*. sop, he gave *it* to Judas Iscariot, *the son* of Simon.
[b] Luke xxii. 3. ch. vi. 70. 27 [b] And after the sop Satan entered into him.
Then said Jesus unto him, That thou doest, do
quickly.

28 Now no man at the table knew for what intent he spake this unto him.

---

of the family used to offer to the guests pieces of meat or bread dipped in a sauce composed of fruit boiled in wine. This was a sign of good-will, and as such was the last appeal to the conscience of Judas. If he had relented, and taken it in the spirit in which it was offered it might have been the beginning of repentance. But as he received it in malice and hypocrisy, it sealed his doom. This last rejection of the good-will of the Lord, whilst hypocritically receiving its outward token, completed the conquest of Satan, and so it is said,

27. "And after the sop Satan entered into him." It was not the sop which enabled Satan to take full possession, but his receiving the sop whilst seeking occasion to betray the Lord.

It is said by St. Luke that Satan entered into Judas at the time when he went his way and communed with the chief priests how he might betray Him. Every suggestion of the evil one, willingly received and consented to, is an entrance of Satan, but this was his final conquest and taking possession of the soul of this bad man, so that there was no further place for repentance.

"That thou doest, do quickly." As if He said, "Thou hast fully determined upon this evil deed, no word of Mine can save thee, by turning thee from thy purpose. It is better for thee to go at once from this holy company. Every moment that thou remainest here adds to thy guilt."

28. "Now no man at the table knew," &c. The words of the Lord revealed to Judas that Jesus knew all, not only his secret determination, but the steps which he had already taken to accomplish his purpose. And probably the sense of his guilt made him surmise that his designs were already known to more than the Lord. He had, no doubt, noticed the beckoning between Peter and John, and that John had asked something of the Lord, and that the Lord had answered him. He was mistaken in all this, for though he had

29 For some *of them* thought, because [c] Judas had the bag, that Jesus had said unto him, Buy *those* *things* that we have need of against the feast; or, that he should give something to the poor.

[c] ch. xii. 6.

30 He then having received the sop went immediately out: and it was night.

31 ¶ Therefore, when he was gone out, Jesus said,

---

been pointed out to two, at least, as the traitor, no one knew the time or the manner of the betrayal, much less imagined that it was coming on so soon. On the contrary,

29. "Some thought, because Judas had the bag, that Jesus had said unto him, Buy those things that we have need of against the feast." This is not to be taken as indicating that the Passover festival had not yet begun, but as it lasted seven days, much more might be required than what had already been bought.

"Or that he should give something to the poor." Notice here how the Lord not only assisted the poor by healing their sicknesses and restoring their sight, but that out of the common purse, containing in all probability at the most very trifling sums, He constantly contributed to the wants of the needy.

Dean Burgon well remarks: "Judas was therefore the almoner of Christ; and surely, if his office of treasurer exposed him to fiery temptation, the insight which he must have obtained in his other capacity into the depth of human misery, and the height of Divine Love, should have sufficed to quench the flame."

30. "He then having received the sop, &c." Why did he immediately leave? Was it because the exact time had come? Not so: that was later on in the night. Was it not rather because, being filled with the evil one, he could no longer endure the presence of the Lord?

"It was night." It is impossible to suppose that this is written merely to show the time. It is the type of the darkness of his deed, and the forecast of the outer darkness into which he plunged.

31. "Therefore, when he was gone out." As soon as the little company is purified from the hateful presence of the traitor, the Lord commences that astonishing unburthening of soul (for though containing the deepest instruction, it can scarcely be called instruc-

[d] Now is the Son of man glorified, and [e] God is glorified in him.

32 [f] If God be glorified in him, God shall also

d ch. xii. 23.
e ch. xiv. 13. 1 Pet. iv. 11.
f ch. xvii. 1, 4, 5, 6.

31. Some translate, "Was the Son of Man glorified," but it yields no sense. The English "is glorified" is past as well as present.

32. "If God be glorified in Him." So A., most Uncials and Cursives, Vulg., Syriac, &c.; omitted by ℵ, B., C., D., L., and old Latin.

tion: it is too personal), which lasts, without interruption (for what is mentioned in verse 31 of the next chapter is no interruption), till they leave for Gethsemane.

It was needful that such thoughts, such promises, such tender warnings, such assurances of loving remembrance, such breathings of peace, should only be poured into the ears of pure and holy souls. And so the Lord is now free to tell them all that is in His heart.

"Now is the Son of man glorified." He had said this before, when He heard of the inquiry of the Greeks; and He says it again, because the great crisis of redemption is closer and surer. The inquiry of the Greeks was the sign, the forecast, the sure presentiment; but the departure of Judas was the first actual step—as we say, "the beginning of the end."

"Now is the Son of man glorified." Now nothing can intervene, nothing can delay: the Son of Man must suffer, must atone by that suffering, must rise again, must ascend, must return in Spirit and power at Pentecost, must be Ruler in the midst of His enemies, must gather the "other sheep" into the one flock, must reign till He hath put all enemies under His feet. Now all is sure and certain. Now is the Son of Man glorified. [The time in the original is past, and so it is virtually in the English.]

"And God is glorified in him." Notice how this accords with so many of the sayings of Christ in this Gospel. As the works of God are seen in the works of Christ, as the words of God are heard in the words of Christ, as the judgment of God is revealed in the decisions of Christ, so the glory of God shines forth in the glory of Christ.

32. "If God be glorified in him [the Son], God shall also glorify him in himself." This "in himself" may refer either to the Father or to the Son. If it refers to the Father, then it means that

glorify him in himself, and [g] shall straightway glorify him.

[g] ch. xii. 28.

33 Little children, yet a little while I am with you. Ye

---

the Father will take the Son back again to Himself, and will glorify Him with the glory which He had with Him before the world was. Or it may mean: God shall glorify Him as the Son of Man in Himself, by showing visibly to the universe that He is the Son of God, and the Mediator between God and all His creatures, so that henceforth all men "should honour the Son even as they honour the Father." Both of these are true explanations of the words.

"And shall straightway glorify him." God glorified Christ in His Death in that, through it, He enabled the Son of Man to show to the universe how God conquers evil, not by mere force, but by submission, humiliation, patience, endurance, self-sacrifice; and instantly on His Death there followed glorification. "The sun was darkened, the rocks rent, the vail of the temple was parted asunder, many bodies of saints that slept arose, the tomb had its seals, the guards sat by; and, while a stone lay over the Body, the Body arose, forty days passed by, and the gift of the Spirit came, and they all straightway preached Him." (Chrysostom.)

33. "Little children, yet a little while I am with you," &c. The thought that He was going back to heaven, unto the bosom of the Father, recalled the thought that He was about to leave them alone, so far as His visible presence was concerned, in a world hostile to them. His heart swells with tenderness and pity; and He no longer calls them disciples, friends, brethren, but "little children." How apt the word! They were little children, as being dearly loved by Him; they were little children, as being very helpless, very young in faith, very imperfect in knowledge.

"Yet a little while [*i.e.* for two or three hours] I am with you in bodily, visible presence." And to creatures such as we are, nothing can make up for this bodily, visible, tangible presence. Nothing, we may be sure, would ever make up for it to the Apostles. They had seen His face, watched His eye, heard every tone of His voice; they had personally experienced His guidance, reproofs, encouragements, patience; and nothing could make up for all this. Even when they were filled with the Spirit, the words of the Lord were fulfilled: "The days will come when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of Man, and shall not see it." (Luke xvii. 22.)

shall seek me; [h] and as I said unto the Jews, Whither I go, ye cannot come; so now I say to you.

34 [i] A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another.

35 [k] By this shall all *men* know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.

[h] ch. vii. 34. & viii. 21.
[i] Lev. xix. 18. ch. xv. 12, 17. Eph. v. 2. 1 Thess. iv. 9. James ii. 8. 1 Pet. i. 22. 1 John ii. 7, 8. & iii. 11, 23. & iv. 21.
[k] 1 John ii. 5. & iv. 20.

"And as I said unto the Jews, Whither I go, ye cannot come." As long as ye are in the flesh, ye cannot come where my spiritual and glorified Body will be. He adds the words, "as I said unto the Jews," to show that, as long as the present state of things lasts, and they are in it, they cannot go where He is. The inability is not merely moral, but, if one may so say, physical—in the nature of things.

34. "A new commandment." Notice the authority of this saying. God had given ten commandments, and the Lord added another as from Himself, "*I give* unto you." In what respect is this commandment new, seeing that the Lord had shown that on two commands—to love God with all our hearts, and our neighbour as ourselves—hang all the law and the prophets? The commandment is new as regards the extent of its fulfilment. "It is not merely 'that ye love one another,' but 'as I have loved you that ye also love one another.' As I have received you, so are ye to receive one another; as I have forgiven you, so are ye to forgive one another; as I have borne with you, so are ye to bear with one another; as I have washed your feet, so are ye to wash one another's feet; as I die for you, so ought ye to lay down your lives for the brethren."

"By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples." Why? Because the disciple learns what his master teaches, and if there be one thing which Christ teaches, it is love. Unless a disciple of Christ shows this love he cannot be said to have learnt of Christ, much less to know Him. All that has to do with Christ, His love of the Father, and the Father's love to Him, His Incarnation, His Life, His miracles, His discourses, even His reproofs, His Death, His Resurrection, His constant Intercession, all teach us His love. If the people of Christ had always so loved one another, the world

36 ¶ Simon Peter said unto him, Lord, whither goest thou? Jesus answered him, Whither I go, thou canst not follow me now; but [l] thou shalt follow me afterwards.

[l] ch. xxi. 18. 2 Pet. i. 14.

37 Peter said unto him, Lord, why cannot I follow thee now? I will [m] lay down my life for thy sake.

[m] Matt. xxvi. 33, 34, 35.

38 Jesus answered him, Wilt thou lay down thy life for my sake? Verily, verily, I say unto thee, The cock shall not crow, till thou hast denied me thrice.

[m] Mark xiv. 29, 30, 31. Luke xxii. 33, 34

---

would have known that we were His disciples. In the disciples they would have seen the Master, and the world would have believed that God had sent Him.

36. "Simon Peter said unto him, Lord whither goest thou?" Peter would have scarcely put this question if he had realized that the Lord was about to leave the world by death. He and the rest of his brethren refused to face the fact.

"Whither I go, thou canst not follow me now." "Thou hast not spiritual strength to follow Me now, and if thou couldst follow Me on the path of suffering, thou couldst not yet ascend up to where I go, far above all heavens."

37. "Peter said to him, Lord, why cannot," &c., "I will lay down," &c. This was the answer of fervent love and loyalty, but as the sad history proved, not of knowledge.

38. "Jesus answered him, Wilt thou . . . . denied me thrice." This is the first intimation the Apostle received of his fall. It has been noticed that though other Apostles—Thomas, Philip, Jude—spake afterwards, and questioned the Lord, yet Peter, otherwise always the foremost, was silent. Had it sunk into his mind, or was he only grieved and vexed? Let us learn from this a lesson of distrust of ourselves and of trust in Him, even when He shows us what is in ourselves.

CHAP. XIV.

LET [a]not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me.

[a] ver. 27. ch. xvi. 22, 23.

1. "Ye believe in God, believe also." The translation is uncertain, owing to the word, "ye believe," in each clause being the same in mood and tense, and may be rendered either indicatively or imperatively. "Ye believe in God, ye believe also in Me," or, "Believe in God, believe also in Me."

1. "Let not your heart be troubled." Let not your heart be troubled at what I have just said: that I should be with you but "a little while," that "ye shall seek me," and that "whither I go ye cannot come."

These words seemed to be a final leave-taking; but He had somewhat qualified them by saying to Peter, "Thou canst not follow me now; but thou shalt follow me afterwards." And now He proceeds to show that the separation was but for a time, and that His departure would be their gain.

"Ye believe in God, believe also in me." Faith in God, and in Himself, will disperse all their trouble. They must have faith in God as the Father, and in Himself as the Son of the Father.

Let the reader notice how the Lord here sets Himself side by side with His Father, as the object of faith—of a faith, too, which should dispel all trouble from the hearts of His followers. Such a command to believe in Him, co-ordinately with His Father, is one of the strongest proofs of His Godhead.

There is considerable doubt respecting the exact translation of the verb in this sentence, because both the words "believe" in the original in each clause are the same in mood and tense. They may be rendered either, "Ye believe in God, ye believe also in me," or "Believe in God, believe also in me."

Either way of translating the verb yields a true and good sense. "Ye believe in God as the Father Who hath sent Me. Ye believe in Me as His very Son, Who, doing nothing of Himself, but by the will of His Father, hath chosen you. What room for distress or anxiety, if ye realize this? Ye are in His hands. Ye are also in Mine. Act on this faith, and dismiss your fears."

2 In my Father's house are many mansions: if *it were* not *so*, I would have told you. [b] I go to prepare a place for you. [b] ch. xiii. 33, 36.

---

2. "Mansions;" abiding places.
"I go to prepare," &c. "For I go." "For" inserted by ℵ, A., B., C., D., K., L., some old Latin, Vulg., and Syriac.

Or if we take "believe" as involving a command, the sense is equally good.

"Believe in God." "Trust in His Love to Me, and to you as Mine, and accept His words implicitly. Believe in Me, and receive all My words implicitly as His words; and this will dispel all your trouble about your future, even though I leave you."

But, it is urged, to those who had from the first believed in God, and had also believed in Jesus, and shown their belief by giving up all and following Him, how could the Lord say, "Believe," as if they believed not? He said it not to them as if they believed not, so counting their faith as nothing, but He said it as marking the weakness and rudimentary nature of their faith. They had faith in God, they had faith in Him; but they must go on from faith to faith. Their faith in the Father and in the Son was as nothing to what it might be, and to what it would shortly be after His Ascension. Faith corresponds to its object. The faith in an infinite God, and in a Saviour Who, being the Son of that God, is one with Him in infinite power and goodness, never can come to an end, so that it should have nothing further to apprehend or realize. As God increasingly reveals Himself, so we should increase in the apprehension of Him—that is, in faith in Him. A Christian can always be bid to believe in God, just as he can be always urged to love God. But it is necessary to explain the words, "believe also in me," so that, if possible, there should not be that abruptness which there now seems to be in passing from the words "believe in me" to the words

2. "In my Father's house are many mansions." The line of thought seems to be somewhat of this sort: "Ye are troubled because of My departure. If ye believe in God as My Father and your Father, and if ye believe in Me as the true and beloved Son of God, then ye believe in Me as the Son over my Father's house, which being His is also mine (Hebrews iii. 6), and is under Me as His Son.

3 And if I go and prepare a place for you, [c] I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that [d] where I am, *there* ye may be also.

[c] ver. 18, 28. Acts i. 11.
[d] ch. xii. 26. & xvii. 24. 1 Thess. iv. 17

That house has rooms [abiding places] for all God's children. There are places in it for the holy angels, for the servants of God, who from the beginning have served Him, for yourselves, and for those who will in future time believe in Me through your words."

"If it were not so, I would have told you [because] I go to prepare a place for you." And if there be no place for you in that sphere to which I am ascending, I would have told you, and not raised your hopes of being with Me where I shall be, but have bid you be content with the low expectations of some Paradise such as your countrymen entertain. But it is far different. The reality will be above your highest desires. I go to prepare a place for you where ye shall be with Me, and behold My glory.

3. "And if I go and prepare. . . . . I will come again, and receive you to myself; that where I am," not in some Paradisaical state, but in the highest heavens, receiving the worship of the angels,

"Ye may be also." We are reminded by these words of the Vision in the Revelation, where the Apostle beholds the abodes which Christ had prepared, when he saw the New Jerusalem "prepared as a bride adorned for her husband" (Rev. xxi. 2).

In this case, then, the Father's house means the final state of blessedness in the presence of God in the heaven of heavens; but there are some who take the "Father's house" to mean the whole kingdom of God with its various spheres or states, for those who are pressing on to perfection: some of these spheres or abiding-places in this world, in the various degrees of grace and service in the Church; some in the state between death and judgment; some in the final state, so that the removal of a soul from this scene is no more than the stepping out of one room into another in the same palace of the same Great King. If this latter be the interpretation, then the Lord's words, "I will come again," are not to be limited to the Second Advent, but signify all the Lord's various comings to His people, as at Pentecost, or, it may be, at death—so that they may then be in a peculiar sense "with Him" (Phil. i. 23), and at the Second Advent.

4 And whither I go ye know, and the way ye know.

5 Thomas saith unto him, Lord, we know not whither thou goest; and how can we know the way?

6 Jesus saith unto him, I am [e]the way, [f]the

[e] Heb. ix. 8.
[f] ch. i. 17. & viii. 32.

4. And whither I go ye know, [and] the way [ye know]." The words in brackets omitted by ℵ, B., C., L.; retained by A., D., later Uncials, almost all Cursives, Vulg., and Syriacs

4. "And whither I go ye know, and the way ye know." "I have told you that I go to the Father, and I have in many ways set before you Myself as the way to God and heaven, as when I said, 'I am the light,' 'I am the door,' 'I am the Shepherd,' and when I gave you to understand that 'I am the ladder which joins earth and heaven'" (John i. 51).

5. "Thomas saith unto him, Lord, we know not whither thou goest; and how," &c. How is it that the Lord, Who knew all within them—their knowledge and their ignorance—tells them that they "knew whither He was going, and they knew the way"? And Thomas, apparently speaking for the rest, says, "How can we know the way, seeing we know not whither Thou goest?" They knew the way because they knew Him; but they knew not what it was to know Him, they realized not their knowledge, and what it involved. What they knew already was very blessed, but it was as nothing compared to what would be theirs, if they followed on to know the Lord fully. No created being can fully know God or the Son of God. "No one knoweth the Son, but the Father."

6. "Jesus saith, I am the way, and the truth, and the life," &c. "I am the way by which alone ye have access to God; but your way to God is not a road from one *place* to another, but it is a spiritual approach of your spirit to the Supreme Spirit, by faith and knowledge; and so "I am the Truth;" by believing in Me, the Truth, ye know Me, and so ye draw near to God; and "I am the Life," for the way of a redeemed spirit to God must not be a dead, but a living way; to approach God, ye must have Life, and I within you am the Life by which ye have the Life of God, and so come to God." The Life here is the climax. The acts of coming to God, and believing in God, are acts of Life, which men have in and through Jesus Christ. If we believe in the Son of God, and are united to Him, and follow Him, then we are in the way to God, we realize and feed upon the truth of God, we live by the Life of God.

truth, and [g] the life: [h] no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.

7 [i] If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also: and from henceforth ye know him, and have seen him.

[g] ch. i. 4. & xi. 25.
[h] ch. x. 9.
[i] ch. viii. 19.

---

7. Tischendorf, following ℵ and D., against all other evidence, reads, "If ye have known Me, ye shall know," &c.

"No man cometh unto the Father, but by me." Let the reader mark these words. They set forth opening and closing. They show the open way in Christ. They close up all other ways. They show the Door to God and heaven; but they equally show that there is but one Door, one Way. No words of Christ are more destructive of modern Liberalism than these, for the Word of God here asserts that no man can come of himself to God, or of himself find God—not even the light of his conscience, or his moral sense, can bring him to the Father, except so far as that moral sense is to be identified with "the true Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." (John i. 9.)

7. "If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also." This is the answer to St. Thomas's remark, in the name of the rest. "If ye had known Me, as from your long converse with Me ye ought to have done, ye would not have asked the question, for ye would have known My Father also, because I am in Him and He in Me. All that can be known of God is seen in Me. In My words, My works, My teaching, My character are seen the words, works, teaching, and character of God My Father; and knowing Me, ye would have known, and come to, My Father." Notice how the Lord had said, "The way ye know," meaning Himself; and yet here He says, "If ye had known me." The same may be said of knowledge as of belief. Christ, the Son of God, being infinite, there are no limits to our knowledge of Him, just as there is no end to our belief in Him. We know Him when we begin to know Him, but through all eternity it will be true, "No one knoweth the Son, but the Father."

"From henceforth ye know him, and have seen him." This "from henceforth" cannot mean from that moment, as if there had been a sudden influx of knowledge into them, but "from about that time"—the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus, and the coming of the

8 Philip saith unto him, Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us.

Holy Ghost all taking place within two months; and by the coming of the Spirit, all the precious instruction they had received from Christ was brought to their remembrance and made clear to them. They then began to realize how the Father and the Son were one; how the Jesus they had familiarly known was the "Image of the Invisible God," "the express Image of His Person." That the words cannot refer to the moment when they were said, is plain from the request of Philip.

8. "Philip saith unto him, Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us." By asking this, he showed plainly that he had not as yet understood what the Lord had said about His intimate relation to the God of Israel. The question is a remarkable one, for it must be taken as the question of one who cannot have been ignorant of the places in the Old Testament which teach that God is not to be seen by mortal eyes: "No man can see My face and live." It was the first article of the faith of a Jew, that God could not be seen, and so that no image must be made of Him. Did Philip then consciously ask that the Lord Jesus should give them a sight of God, which God Himself had refused to Moses? If so the question implies very surprising faith in the power of Jesus to reveal God, but it also shows surprising ignorance—ignorance of the very many words of Christ in which He had in Philip's hearing identified His working, His judging, His doctrine, His glory, His keeping of His sheep with that of the Father. Nay, He had even said in so many words, "He that seeth Me, seeth Him that sent Me" (ch. xii. 45). The question then is just such an one as a believing and loving follower of Christ before Pentecost would ask. It is the question of implicit faith in Christ in that He was able to show to men the invisible God, and yet of profound ignorance respecting the drift of the whole teaching of Christ hitherto, which was not simply to teach men His own power and Godhead, but the Father's power and Godhead as set forth in the Son.

And with this agrees the Lord's answer.

9. "Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip?" "During the years that you have known Me, you have seen My mighty works, but you have heard Me perpetually ascribing all to the Father within

9 Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? [k] he that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou *then*, Shew us the Father?

[k] ch. xii. 45. Col. i. 15. Heb. i. 3.

10 Believest thou not that [l] I am in the Father, and the Father in me? the words that I speak unto you [m] I speak not of myself: but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works.

[l] ver. 20. ch. x. 38. & xvii. 21, 23.

[m] ch. v. 19. & vii. 16. & viii. 28. & xii. 49.

11 Believe me that I *am* in the Father, and the Father in me: [n] or else believe me for the very works' sake.

[n] ch. v. 36. & x. 38.

---

10. "The works." ℵ, B., D. read, "His own works;" A., later Uncials, all Cursives, Vulg., and Syriacs (Peshito and Cureton) read as in Rec. Text.

Me. So with my teaching, so with My whole Life. I have laboured to convince you that I do nothing, teach nothing, work no mighty works, apart from the Father. In nothing are We separate—in all are We one. Hast thou not known Me then as in Myself the Revealer of the Father? not the prophet who speaks in the name of the Father, not the teacher who teaches about the Father, but the Son in Whom the Father is, and in Whom the Father speaks, and in Whom the Father works." Philip, then, had not yet learned that great lesson of God: "No man hath seen God at any time, the only-begotten Son [or God only begotten], Who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him."

10. "Believest thou not that I am in the Father?" This question contains a summary of the Lord's teaching respecting the oneness of Himself with the Father, for no clause of it is new. "I am in the Father, and the Father in Me," is a repetition of x. 38: "That ye may know that the Father is in Me, and I in Him." "The words that I speak, I speak not of Myself," correspond to "My doctrine is not Mine, but His that sent Me" (vii. 16). "The Father that dwelleth in Me, He doeth the works," corresponds to "I do nothing of Myself," of ch. v. 19, and viii. 28.

Stier has a very good remark on the distinction of words and works and yet their oneness in God: "His words are no other than works, and His works are speaking and testifying words."

11. "Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me," &c., *i.e.*, "Believe the words that I have so repeatedly spoken, that

12 °Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater *works* than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father.

° Matt. xxi. 21. Mark xvi. 17. Luke x. 17.

---

12. "My Father." "The Father" read by ℵ, A., B., D., L., 1, 22, 33, 42, 69 m., old Latin, Vulg., Coptic, Arm., &c., and some versions. Later Uncials, most Cursives, and Syriac read, "My Father."

the Father is in Me and I in Him; or, if you cannot believe the *words*, look at My works; would the God of Israel work so mightily in Me unless I spoke the very truth respecting Myself and Him?"

12. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do," &c. "Think ye that I tell you a very great thing when I say that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me? I tell you a far more wonderful thing. The man who believes in Me shall not only do the works which I do, but still greater works, and this because I go to the Father. Because I go to the Father the Comforter will come unto you, and He will bring My Father and Myself into you, as We have never been before, and as a natural consequence ye shall not only do the works that I do, but greater works." (See verses 20 and 23.)

The works which Christ did were, particularly, healing the sick, casting out devils, and raising the dead, and these the Apostles did (Acts ix. 34, Acts xvi. 18, and Acts ix. 40 and xx. 9, 10); and not only so, but we are assured by two statements in the Acts of the Apostles that there was the same exuberance of Divine power attending upon the followers of Christ as upon Christ Himself, for the shadow of Peter passing by healed the sick (Acts v. 15), and handkerchiefs and aprons which had but touched the person of Paul, expelled both diseases and evil spirits (Acts xix. 12).

But what are the "greater works than these"? Evidently those which Christ could not do when on earth in His own Person, because till He had undergone His Baptism of Suffering and Blood, He was "straitened" (Luke xii. 5). After this His visible presence was withdrawn, and then He ascended to work with far more power from a far higher sphere. He was to be mightier in His Apostles than He had been in His own Person. The "greater works," then, are the Pentecostal works, not the speaking with tongues only, though this never took place before, but the conversion of multitudes of souls by the preaching of the Word, and its far more power-

13 [p] And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son.

[p] Matt. vii. 7. & xxi. 22. Mark xi. 24. Luke xi. 9. ch. xv. 7, 16, & xvi. 23, 24. James i. 5. 1 John iii. 22. & v. 14.

---

ful effects than when He was present in the flesh. When He ascended there were but one hundred and twenty disciples in Jerusalem, a very little after there were five thousand. The Fathers notice also the greater depth of the work. Before His Ascension He could not prevail upon one rich young man to give up all and follow Him: after Pentecost a very great number "sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men." Again, look at the Baptism, the Eucharist, the Absolution, the Laying on of hands that men might receive the Holy Ghost. These things are in a higher sphere than miracles, they are mysteries. Miracles only witness to a greater power than that of this world. Mysteries such as the Christian make men partakers of a higher Nature.

13. "And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father," &c. What is the connection between this and the last verse? Evidently this:—All the mighty works done by the Apostles, and those with them, were actually or virtually done in answer to prayer. There was either the direct prayer, or that secret looking up to God, dependence upon Him, and faith in His peculiar presence which was as much an act of prayer as a direct request. "Whatsoever then I shall put it into your hearts to ask for, for the furtherance and well-being of My Church and kingdom, that will I do. I will do it by the Father's will and by the power of the whole Godhead, which will be wielded by Me, and this not for My glory, but that the Father may be glorified in me." Notice here how on His Mediatorial throne the Son is the same as when in humiliation here on earth—ever thinking of, ever doing all for, the glory of the Father, as He had said: "I seek not mine own glory." "I honour My Father." "I seek His glory that sent Me." Notice also that no assertion of essential Godhead can be greater than this. He must be able to hear all prayer, no matter how secret, to exercise all power, to overrule all events, and to foresee all contingences Who is able to say "whatsoever ye shall ask, that will I do."

14. "If ye shall ask any thing in my name, I will do it." Why

14 If ye shall ask any thing in my name, I will do *it*.
15 ¶ [q] If ye love me, keep my commandments.

q ver. 21, 23. ch. xv. 10, 14. 1 John v. 3.

14. "Ask any thing in my name." "Ask me any thing" read by ℵ, B., E., H., some Cursives, some old Latin (c, f), Vulg., Syriac; but "me" omitted by A., D., G., K., L., M., most Cursives, some old Latin (a, e, g), and Coptic.

is the promise repeated? Dean Burgon suggests that it is to impress it upon us. "Is the saying 'doubled' because the thing is established by God (Gen. xli. 32), and was repeated simply in order to impress it more deeply upon His hearers?" It may well have been so. For we have here three primary, all-important truths—that prayer is to be offered to God in the Name of Jesus: that we have liberty, nay, we are encouraged to ask for *every* thing in His Name, and that what we ask in His Name, He Himself, the One Mediator, will grant. The promise, though primarily addressed to the Apostles, is, of course, given through them to the whole Church. It is but one of many promises of similar breadth and distinctness.

15. "If ye love me, keep my commandments. And I will pray the Father," &c. We cannot help asking what commandments were the twelve to keep, that Christ might pray the Father to give them the Holy Ghost?

They can scarcely mean such commandments as those in the Decalogue, the rules of the ordinary duties of life towards God and towards our neighbour. Now the Lord is recorded, in the last chapter (xiii), to have given to them two commandments, suited not merely to their needs, but necessary to the birth of the Church. The Spirit could not come down upon a divided company. He must descend upon one at Unity in itself. Now, these two commandments which the Lord had given to them had to do with this Unity, this mutual love; the one was, that they should follow the spirit of His example in having washed their feet, *i.e.*, that they should in love serve one another. In order to this they must thoroughly cleanse themselves from the spirit of self-seeking, and rivalry, and ambition, and be in humbleness of mind as little children: the other was, that they should love one another as He had loved them. They seem to have obeyed these commands. They seem all to have held together. They continued in united prayer with one another, and with the Holy Virgin the Lord's mother, and the other women, and His brethren, and so

16 And I will pray the Father, and [r] he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever:

[r] ch. xv. 26. & xvi. 7. Rom. viii. 15, 26.

16. "May abide in you." So A., D., later Uncials, all Cursives, Vulg., Peshito Syriac; but "may be in you" read in ℵ, B., L., some old Latin, Cureton Syriac, &c.

when the moment decreed for the descent of the Holy Ghost had arrived, "they were all with one accord in one place."

Whatever further meaning "keep My commandments" may have which has not come down to us, this, assuredly, has been recorded very emphatically. The Lord prayed that they should be one, and they were one till the all-important moment.

16. "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter." He prays to the Father for the gift, and yet He Himself sends Him (xvi. 7). So both on earth and in heaven He does nothing apart from the Father, and the Father does all in, and through, and by Him. "Another Comforter," another Advocate,—the word being the same as in 1 John ii. 2: "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous."

"Another Comforter." Here the Lord reckons Himself as an Advocate, or Guide, or Comforter, and the Holy Spirit as another. So that here we have a very distinct enunciation of the personality of the Spirit of God. No office can be more personal, as requiring personal attributes or qualifications, than that of an Advocate. Is our Lord then a person? So is the Holy Spirit.

But in what sense is the Holy Spirit an Advocate? for we generally look upon Him as an Enlightener, Teacher, and Guide. He is an Advocate within us as St. Paul teaches us when He speaks of the Holy Spirit helping our infirmities in prayer, and "making intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered" (Rom. viii. 26.) He is an Advocate because He brings within us Christ, the other Advocate, and, by renewing our souls, makes us acceptable to God.

"That he may abide with you for ever." Here, no doubt, is an allusion to the outward visible departure of Christ. The Lord hitherto had been their Guide and Teacher in His own visible Person, and He would equally guide and teach them, but by His Spirit; indeed, more effectually, for He would, after His departure, work more directly and effectually upon their hearts.

"For ever." This cannot be merely during the lifetime even of

17 *Even* [s]the Spirit of truth; [t]whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, [u]and shall be in you.

[s] ch. xv. 26. & xvi. 13. 1 John iv. 6.
[t] 1 Cor. ii. 14.
[u] 1 John ii. 27.

---

17. "Shall be" read by א, A., L., later Uncials, most Cursives, Vulg., Peshito, and some versions; "is" read by B., D., 1, 22, 69, 251, 254, old Latin, and Cureton Syriac.

the one who would linger longest upon earth. It must correspond to that other promise, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

17. "Even the Spirit of truth." So called because He searches and knows the deepest truths of God (1 Cor. ii.), and makes them known to us. "The Spirit utters, teaches, brings to us as Spirit, in real and living apprehension, the Truth; that is, concerning ourselves, the will of God as regards His justice and grace towards us, our position, and calling, the way of return to God through the Person of Christ; shows, glorifies, opens to us this way as truth and life." (Stier.) Hitherto we have had to notice how the Lord asserts His oneness with the Father, so that He does nothing, judges nothing, teaches nothing, except what He sees in the Father; now we shall in the rest of the discourse have to notice how inseparable are Himself and the Holy Ghost, so that He returns by the Spirit, He dwells in us, He instructs us, He consoles us wholly by His Spirit.

"Whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him." It is a remarkable fact, that worldly men who can descant upon God as the Supreme Being, and upon Christ as the great Exemplar, and even the Mediator, cannot even frame their lips to speak of the Holy Spirit. His very Person seems hidden from them, much more His teaching and enlightening of individual souls.

"It seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him," &c. Godet remarks admirably on this: "To receive this Divine Teacher a moral preparation is necessary. The soul in which He comes to dwell must have been withdrawn from the profane sphere. This is the reason that Jesus said at the head of the passage (ver. 15), 'Keep my commandments,' and here also added, 'Whom the world cannot receive.' It was by no arbitrary act that the Spirit came down on a hundred and twenty (?) only on the day of Pente-

18 [x] I will not leave you ‖ comfortless: [y] I will come to you.

19 Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more; but [z] ye see me: [a] because I live, ye shall live also.

[x] Matt. xxviii. 20
‖ Or, *orphans.*
[y] ver. 3, 28.
[z] ch. xvi. 16.
[a] 1 Cor. xv. 20.

---

cost, and not on all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the former having alone undergone the indispensable preparation. Jesus explains wherein this preparation, which the world is without, consists: before receiving they must have seen and known the Spirit." "This preparation had been effected in the disciples during the three years they had passed in association with Jesus. His words, His life had been a constant emanation of the Spirit, and their hearts had done homage to the exalted holiness of this manifestation. This had not been done by the world, nor by the Jews, who, when they heard His words said, "He hath a devil." They had thus remained alien to the sphere and influence of the Spirit, and they were not in a condition to receive Him. The preparatory operation of the Spirit upon the disciples is expressed by the words, 'He dwelleth with you;' and the closer relations into which He would enter with them at Pentecost by, 'He shall be in you.' "

18. "I will not leave you comfortless [or orphans]," *i.e.*, without protection or guidance.

"I will come to you." In these two verses (18 and 19) the Lord shows how His most intimate presence is assured to them by the coming of the Holy Ghost: "I will come to you," *i.e.* by the Spirit.

19. "Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more;" *i.e.* in the only way in which, whilst it remains the world, it can see Me, in visible, bodily, tangible presence.

"But ye see me." Ye see Me with that eye which will give you continued possession of Me, *i.e.* with the eye of faith. Faith is the only faculty by which I can be savingly and effectually apprehended, and this faith is the work of the Spirit.

"Because I live, ye shall live also." The Spirit, besides enabling you to see Me, will convey my Life into you, for in Me He is the Spirit of Life. (Rom. viii. 2.)

20. "At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father." "At that day," *i.e.*, the day in which they would see Him with the true

20 At that day ye shall know that [b] I *am* in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you.

21 [c] He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him.

[b] ver. 10. ch. x. 38. & xvii. 21, 23, 26.

[c] ver. xv. 23. 1 John ii. 5. & v. 3.

---

spiritual sight, and in which they would have His Life within them, and this time was on and after the day of Pentecost.

"Ye shall know." Ye take it only on my word now, then ye shall realize My oneness with the Father in essence, will, and power.

"And ye in me." And if in Me, in God; and so St. Paul writes to the churches as "in God the Father, and in the Lord Jesus Christ." (1 Thess. i. 1.)

"And I in you." "Know ye not," asks the same Apostles, "how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?" (2 Cor. xiii. 5.)

The greatest fact which the Church has given to it to believe and realize is the Oneness of Him Who was crucified with the unseen and eternal God, and our union with Him and with one another in His Body, the Church. This latter union, the reader will remember, is by the Lord made to depend upon our eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood (chap. vi. 56). St. Augustine, however, explains "at that day" as meaning the day in which we shall be raised up in our glorified bodies.

21. "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is," &c. "Hath" and "keepeth"—perhaps, rather, "holdeth" and "keepeth"; holding seems more than merely having in memory or in a book. St. Augustine seems to recognize both the higher and lower meaning of "having": "He that hath in the memory, and keepeth in the life; that hath in the discourse and keepeth in the manners; that hath in hearing, and keepeth in doing; or that hath in doing and keepeth in persevering."

"He it is that loveth me." Notice how throughout the Lord's words and those of His servants there is but one test of love, which is obedience: not words, not warm feelings, not zeal in defending the truth, but obedience.

"He that loveth me." He that thus loveth Me "shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him." Here is again the unity between

22 [d] Judas saith unto him, not Iscariot, Lord how is it
[d] Luke vi. 16. that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world?

[e] ver. 15 23 Jesus answered and said unto him, [e] If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my
[f] 1 John ii. 24. Rev. iii. 20. Father will love him, [f] and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.

---

the Father and the Son. He who shows by obedience his love to the Son, him the Father loves, and the Lord, Whose love is the same with that of the Father, always approving the same character, says, "I will love him, not simply and solely because he obeys Me, but because he is the object of My Father's love, and I will manifest Myself to him by My Spirit.

22. "Judas (not Iscariot) saith unto him, Lord, how is it that," &c. This question seems natural. If Christ was the Messiah spoken of by the prophets, the Saviour of the World, why should He not manifest Himself to the world? Is the manifestation of the Son of God always to be to the few, as it has hitherto been?

23. "Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me," &c. Jesus answers in effect that the world cannot receive Him, because it is not prepared so to do. Judas does not understand that the Lord alludes to that secret spiritual manifestation which can only be apprehended by the obedient and loving believer. Our Lord would in one sense be manifested to the world because His Gospel would be preached to all nations, and Judas and his fellow Apostles would be the means of making it known; but the true effectual manifestation whereby they would see Him Who is invisible, would be only to the man who really loves Him, and so keeps His words. The Lord thus repeats what He had said in verse 21, but with a remarkable difference; there it was, "I will love him, and manifest myself to him;" here it is, "We will come to him, and make our abode with him." Notice this wonderful advance. The question of Judas seems to have been ordered to bring it out. Instead of the Son only manifesting Himself, the Father and the Son will come, and do more than come, they will make their abode with him; the same Greek word being used as in verse 2, there rendered mansions: as the true Christian has an abiding place in God, so also God has in him. Here, again, is to be

24 He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings: and [g] the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me.

[g] ver. 10. ch. v. 19, 38. & vii. 16. & viii. 28. & xii. 49.

25 These things have I spoken unto you, being *yet* present with you.

26 But [h] the Comforter, *which is* the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name,

[h] ver. 16. Luke xxiv. 49. ch. xv. 26. & xvi. 7.

---

noticed the oneness of the Father and the Son: as the Son does nothing, judges nothing, teaches nothing, except in unity with the Father, so they are not separated, but abide together in the Christian; and, of course, it must be so if the Father is in the Son, and the Son in the Father.

24. "He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings." "And if he keeps not My sayings, he keeps not My Father's sayings and cannot love Him truly, for this reason, that what I say is not My word, but My Father's." There can be no true love to Christ without true love to God, because the true love of Christ is obedience to His words, and His words are the words of God.

25. "These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you," *i.e.*, while yet abiding with you visibly in the flesh.

26. "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name," &c. "The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost." There seems to be amongst modern commentators a desire to confine the meaning of Paraclete to Advocate, but Chrysostom, whose vernacular was the Greek, expressly connects this name with "comfort." "He continually calleth Him Comforter, because of the afflictions which then possessed them." In the Acts also we read, "The churches, walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost."

"In my name," *i.e.*, not only at My intercession, but as parallel to "I am come in My Father's name." "In My power so as to make Me present, so that in all that He works or teaches, I work and I teach."

"He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance." In all probability this means, "He shall teach you the meaning of all things I have said unto you, and bring to your remembrance all things whatsoever I have said unto you." Whilst

[j] he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.

[j] ch. ii. 22. & xii. 16. & xvi. 13. 1 John ii. 20, 27.

27 [k] Peace I leave with you, my peace I give

[k] Phil. iv. 7. Col. iii. 15.

---

the Lord was with them the disciples understood His teaching very imperfectly indeed. They received His words with implicit faith, and were ready to receive any expansion or explanation of them, but they understood them very partially. Take, as examples, the three questions addressed to the Lord in this chapter: "We know not whither thou goest, and how can we know the way?" "Lord, show us the Father." "How is it that thou wilt manifest Thyself to us and not unto the world?" It is impossible to imagine any Apostle putting any of these questions to our Lord after Pentecost, for it had then become a part of their spiritual existence to realize that Christ had taken His seat at the right hand of God, that the first work of the Holy Spirit Whom He had sent was to reveal the Father Himself to men, and that He manifested Himself to believers in a hidden and spiritual way by the Holy Ghost.

Does the first "all things" refer to Christ's oral teaching, "all things whatsoever I have said unto you"? Most probably so. Because in the teaching of the Apostles, even in that of St. Paul, raised up to do a work, in a great measure, independently of the twelve, there was nothing new. It is, as I have noticed, one great feature of this very Gospel to show this; to show that the doctrine which, before the writing of this Gospel, permeated the Church through St. Paul, was all based upon our Lord's own teaching. "He was to teach them all things, not as though Christ's teaching was incomplete, but inasmuch as it was imperfectly understood. He was to bring all things to their remembrance, not merely as enabling their memories to retain the actual words and matter of their Lord's teaching; but as illuminating their minds to see and hold fast all that was contained in it, to clear up its difficulties, to carry it out to its consequences, to apply its principles to all particular cases; to expand and connect all its separate oracles into one consistent and complete system of Heavenly wisdom." (Burgon.)

27. "Peace I leave with you." "I am on the eve of departure, and I leave you peace, the peace of the Spirit, as my best legacy; and not only peace, but *My* peace, the perfection of peace, some of that

unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you. [l] Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid. [l] ver. 1.

28 Ye have heard how [m] I said unto you, I go [m] ver. 3, 18. away, and come *again* unto you. If ye loved me,

---

unutterable calmness and stillness which is in the bosom of My Father and Myself I give unto you." This peace has two aspects. It is peace towards God from a sense of submission to Him, and oneness with Him. This is the peace of Christ in the Godhead. Peace also with one another. This St. Augustine notices, "Peace He leaves with us, that even here we may love one another. Peace He leaves with us, that we may not concerning our hidden things judge one another."

"Not as the world giveth." The common salutation of the Eastern world is, "Peace be unto you," but this is at the best a wish, too often a hollow and unreal expression. The world cannot give peace, for it is not at peace either with God or with itself. And if it could, it could not give *permanent* peace because itself is passing away. "I give peace because I give reconciliation with God and union with God, and with one another. I give here everlasting peace because I shall reign for ever."

28. "Ye have heard how I said unto you .... my Father is greater than I." There are two important statements in this verse:

1. That the Father is greater than the Son: "My Father is greater than I."

2. That the disciples, if they loved Jesus, would rejoice that He was going to One greater than Himself.

The words "my Father is greater than I," could not with any propriety fall from the lips of a mere creature in such a context as this. The mere utterance of such a thing by One Who is beyond conception great and good, implies that He considers Himself in the same sphere, so to speak, with God, or how could there be any comparison? "How could nothingness institute a comparison between itself and God? God alone can compare Himself with God." (Godet.)

There can be little doubt about the Lord's meaning, if we take into consideration the principal statements in this Gospel respecting the Son of God and His relations to His Father. He is equal to Him, and yet subordinate to Him. Equal to the Father in that

ye would rejoice, because I said, [n] I go unto the Father: for [o] my Father is greater than I.

[n] ver. 12. ch. xvi. 16. & xx. 17.

[o] See ch. v. 18. & x. 30. Phil. ii. 6.

---

28. "I said" omitted by ℵ, A., B., D., K., L., most old Latin, Vulg., Peshito and Cureton Syriac, and some versions; retained by F., G., H., M., S., T., Δ, and most Cursives.

He does all that the Father does, and yet so far subordinate to Him that He receives commands from Him (x. 18, xii. 49, xv. 10).

He is equal to the Father in nature, because He is the own Son, the proper Son, of the Father. God is His own Father, and so in asserting this He makes Himself equal with God. (Ch. v. 18.) It is the glory of a father, as a father, to beget a son of the same nature as himself, and so in nature equal to himself.

He is equal to Him in power. There are three works of God than which we can conceive none greater, creating all things, upholding all things, judging all men, and all these are ascribed to the Son; creating all things, in that "all things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made" (John i. 3); upholding all things, in that He says, "My Father worketh hitherto and I work" (ch. v. 19); Judging all men, in that "God hath committed all judgment unto the Son" (ch. v. 22). So that, in all that constitutes God, He is equal with God, and yet He is sent by God, He receives commands from God respecting everything which He is to do and teach, "He seeks not His own glory, but His glory that sent Him."

So that the Father is greater in that He is the first Person, in that He commands, in that He sends, in that He exercises the authority, and receives the honour of a Father; and the Son is subordinate in that He is "of the Father" and obeys Him, and returns to Him. If the reader desires to pursue this further, he has only to refer to so well-known a book as "Pearson on the Creed," on the first article (old paging, 34, 35, 36, marked in margin): "In general, then, we may safely observe that in the very name of Father there is something of eminence which is not in that of Son, and some kind of priority we must ascribe unto Him Whom we call the first, in respect of Him Whom we call the Second Person; and as we cannot but ascribe it, so must we endeavour to preserve it. Now that privilege or priority consisteth not in this, that the essence or attributes of the One are greater than the essence or

29 And [p] now I have told you before it come to pass, that, when it is come to pass, ye might believe.

[p] ch. xiii. 19. & xvi. 4.

30 Hereafter, I will not talk much with you: [q] for the prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me.

[q] ch. xii. 31. & xvi. 11.

---

attributes of the Other (for we shall hereafter demonstrate them to be the same in Both ; but only this, that the Father hath that essence from Himself, the Son by communication from the Father," &c. In page 34 (old paging marked in margin) there is a long note consisting of extracts from the Fathers (Athanasius, Basil, Gregory, Nazianzen, &c.) taking this view of this passage.

But what is the reason why those who loved the Son should rejoice because He returned to One greater than Himself? Evidently this: He returns to One Who, being greater than Himself, is able to reinvest Him with the glory which He had with Him before the world was. He returns to the Head of all things, to have all power given to Him, to have all things put under His feet, to wield His Father's power from His Right Hand. If, then, they loved Him, they would rejoice that He went back to the bosom of that Father, Who is "above all, through all, in all."

29. "And now I have told you before it come to pass . . . . might believe." "If ye had seen Me depart by a violent death before My work in the world seemed to have commenced, your faith might have been shaken, but I have told you all that shall befall Me, so that ye may expect it all and be unmoved."

30. "Hereafter I will not talk much with you . . . . hath nothing in me." I will talk no more with you, for the time is very short. A few more words to you, and to My Father commending you to Him, is all that remains: The enemy is now at hand. When he left me before it was but for a season. (Luke iv. 13.)

"For the prince of this world cometh." It was not Judas only, or Caiaphas, or Pontius Pilate. There was one who inspired and directed all.

"And hath nothing in me." He has tried Me, and sifted Me, and watched Me, but he can find nothing of his own, nothing of evil within Me, and so I can die on behalf of My brethren.

31. "But that the world may know that I love the Father." Why then do I, for a moment, seem to succumb to him, so as to receive

31 But that the world may know that I love the Father;
r ch. x. 18. Phil. ii. 8. Heb. v. 8. and r as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do. Arise, let us go hence.

Death, the wages of sin? Because I love the Father, Who hath sent Me to redeem His fallen creatures by suffering such a Death.

"And as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do." The Father has given me a commandment that I should "lay down my life that I may take it again," and so I do.

"Arise, let us go hence." "Let us go hence to the place where I may be taken, for all things are ordered. I cannot be taken here." Thus the Lord, of His own free will, set forth to obey the Father's will, and to redeem us by His Death. (See Matthew xx. 17; Mark x. 32-34.)

THE TRUE VINE.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

"I am the true vine." As this parable or proverb of the Vine and the Branches is of supreme importance, setting forth, as it does, the great Church truth of mystical union with the Son of God, as well as the means for maintaining it, and our liability to fall from it, it may be well to make one or two remarks by way of introduction.

1. This is the first place where the Apostles (and in them the whole Church) are said to be "in Christ." In the discourse in the synagogue at Capernaum (John vi. 56), the Lord had given a promise that, if men would do a certain thing, which He spoke of as "eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood," He would abide in them, and they in Him. In the last chapter (xiv. 20), He had promised that, after a little while—*i.e.* after the Spirit had descended—they should know, *i.e.* realize more perfectly, that He should be in them, and they in Him. Now, for the first time, He speaks to them as actually "in Him."

Now this He does immediately after the Institution of the Eucha-

rist, when He had given to them His Body and His Blood. So that, as they had fulfilled the condition, He speaks to them as having received the promise.

If the reader will consider the very important application of the two words, "in Christ," throughout the Pauline Epistles, he will see how necessary it is to consider the circumstances under which they were first used.

2. We have, in these words, the Church for the first time described as a living body, or organization, having a common life in Christ. There are in Scripture three organizations, which set forth the relations of Christ to His Church.

(1.) That of a King and His Kingdom. This is the one which commonly prevails in the Synoptics. It is not mentioned in St. John's Gospel, in which its place is supplied by the Shepherd and the Sheep. It sets forth kingly power, government, protection, and reward on the one side, and loyalty, loving obedience, and willing service on the other; but it is an outward union, compared to the other two—there being no common life in the King and His subjects, as there is between the Vine and its branches, or between the Body and its Head.

(2.) That of a Tree and its branches. Here it is a Vine and its branches, but in Rom. xi., an olive tree. Here is a far closer union, because the figure is that of an organization in which there dwells one life. The life of the stem, through its juices or sap, rises into the branches, and, circulating through the larger limbs into the smaller branches, produces fruit.

(3.) The Head of the human body and the members of the body (1 Cor. xii.). Here there is a very important advance. For the soul or mind which dwells in the head makes its influence felt all through the body, directing through the nerves the motion of each limb to one end, and making the whole produce, not some insensible thing, such as grapes, but the works of active intelligent life. Again, we have in the figure of the body the distinctions of offices and functions, which we have not in the vine. But the illustrative figure of the Head and members is wanting in two respects —first, the head is the source of guidance or direction, not of nourishment; secondly, the body cannot have a new limb inserted into it, or it would become a monster; neither can it have a limb removed, or it would be maimed: whereas the tree can have a branch of another tree grafted into it; and many trees, particularly

the vine, must be continually pruned of worthless branches, if they are to continue to bear fruit.

3. This is the place where our Lord sets forth the great truth of "Justification of Life," which it was the special mission of St. Paul to expand and apply universally. Justification, as set forth both by the Lord here, and by St. Paul, in Rom. ch. v. 18, is a matter of life rather than of imputation. It is the Resurrection Life of the Lord, permeating His Church, and every member of it; and so is the product of the Lord's Resurrection (Rom. iv. 25). The formal connection between this our Lord's enunciation of Justification, and that of His servant, is in Rom. xi. 17-22, where the same image of a tree is used. The spiritual connection is evident from the use of the terms, "in Christ" and "Christ in us," which are used here by the Lord, and are throughout the Pauline Epistles the characteristic of the justified man.

CHAP. XV.

I AM the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman.

---

1. "I am the true vine," or "I am the Vine, the true One." He is the true Vine, just as He is the true Bread. He is the Vine in which we are, for all purposes of Christian life and Christian good works, just as He is the Bread, of which, if a man eat, he shall live for ever (vi. 51). The earthly bread and the earthly vine are true gifts of God. They nourish and sustain the earthly life which God has given to men; but they are, each in their way, types of a greater thing, which is able to sustain an eternal life. And so this latter is their truth, their fulfilment.

Again, the Lord and His Church is the true Vine, as compared with the carnal Israel, which is also compared to a vine. "I had planted thee a noble vine, wholly a right seed." (Jeremiah ii. 21.) "Christ, claiming to be '*the true vine*,' claims perfectly to realize in Himself that Divine idea which Israel, after the flesh, had altogether failed to fulfil." (Trench.)

Commentators have been anxious to find something which they think may have suggested this comparison to our Lord, such as a

2 [a] Every branch in me that beareth not fruit [a] Matt. xv. 13

vine on the sides of the house where was the upper room, or the golden vine mentioned by Josephus over the entrance into the Temple, or the vineyards they passed through on their way out of the city, or the burning of heaps of withered branches which had been cut off in the process of pruning. But, if we are obliged to seek some outward suggesting cause, why not suppose that it is to be found in the words which the Lord had so lately uttered, "I will not drink henceforth of this *fruit of the vine*"?

Another question of far more importance is, "Why did the Lord choose the comparison of the vine, and not of some other tree?" The answer is, that the vine is of no use whatsoever, except for the bearing of fruit. It is fit only for producing grapes, or for fuel; and it is the only well-known tree which absolutely requires yearly pruning; so that the purging or cleansing which to many trees is only occasional, is to it a necessity, if it is to fulfil its place amongst trees; so that it sets forth the twofold truth, that the one thing required of the Christian is fruit, and that, to bear fruit, he must be purged or cleansed.

"My Father is the husbandman." Having included Himself in the Vine as its stem or trunk, the Vinedresser or Husbandman must be Another besides Himself; and so He likens His Father (in Whom, however, He works, and Who works in Him) to the husbandman who prunes the vine. He is the true Vine, not as God, but in respect of His perfect human nature as the Second Adam; and so, as Augustine asks, "Are husbandman and vine one? Nay; and, therefore, that Christ is the Vine, is in that regard in which He saith, 'The Father is greater than I;' while, in regard that He saith, 'I and the Father are one,' He, too, is the Husbandman. And, in fact, when speaking of the Father as the Husbandman, He had said that He taketh away the unfruitful branches, but purgeth the fruitful, that they may bear more fruit, He straightway shows that He (the Son) doth Himself also purge the branches, saying, 'Now ye are clean, because of the word which I have spoken unto you.' So that in this, as in all else, the Persons in the Trinity work together."

2. "Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away." It is impossible to avoid the inference from this that a branch may abide for a time in Christ, and then be taken away. All attempts to

he taketh away: and every *branch* that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit.

---

2. "He purgeth it." "He cleanseth it . . . . Already ye are clean because of the word," &c. (Alford and Revisers).

get rid of this conclusion are dishonest and futile, and yet it is not to be wondered at that men, even good men, do all they can to avoid it, for anything more terrible cannot be conceived than that a man should have been for ever so short a time in Christ, and yet be cast away.

What is the meaning of this "being taken away?" It cannot mean removed by death, but cut off from that inherence in His Son which God alone knows and recognizes; so that the man so taken away may be for years in the visible unity, and yet be secretly severed from the true Unity; so that henceforth the Word and Sacraments, and ministerial action which nourish the fruitful branches, profit him no more. But as God alone brings about this "taking away," so He alone perfectly and infallibly knows who those are on whom this sentence has been passed. It is not for us to judge. We have to speak to all in the visible Unity as if they were in real connection with the Head, or may at least, by repentance, be restored to that connection. But we have very earnestly to press upon all the need of self-examination as to how they stand in Christ, remembering the words of the Apostle: "Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves. Know ye not your own selves how that Jesus Christ is in you except ye be reprobates?" (2 Cor. xiii. 5.) And what should be the constant prayer of every baptized man but this, "renew in me, most loving Father, whatsoever hath been decayed by the fraud and malice of the devil, or by my own carnal will and frailty"?

"Every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it (literally, he cleanseth it), that it may bring forth more fruit." Because of the sharp cutting indicated by the process of pruning, this purging or cleansing is generally considered as brought about by afflictions, distresses, persecutions, and such things, and we know that an Apostle says, "Whom the Lord loveth, he chasteneth," and that, "If ye be without chastisement, then are ye bastards and not sons." But the next verse seems to show that the most important instrument of cleansing is the Word: "Now ye are clean (catharoi)

3 [b] Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you.

4 [c] Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me.

[b] ch. xiii. 10. & xvii. 17. Ephes. v. 26. 1 Pet. i. 22.
[c] Col. i. 23. 1 John ii. 6.

---

through the word which I have spoken unto you." The same word as in the former verse, is rendered "purgeth." The two clauses should be translated: "He cleanseth it that it may bring forth more fruit; now ye are cleansed through the word which I have spoken unto you."

What is this word? Not any particular word, such as, "Now ye are clean, but not all," but rather all that Christ had said from the beginning. All His words had been received by them, and had contributed to make them what they were.

Augustine has a very good remark on those who are "clean," yet requiring further cleansing: "For were they not clean they could not have borne fruit; yet every one that beareth fruit the Husbandman 'purgeth, that he may bear more fruit.' He bears fruit because he is clean: and that he may bear more fruit, he is purged still. For who in this life is so clean, that he does not need to be cleansed more and more?"

4. "Abide in me, and I in you." This does not mean, "Abide in Me, and I will abide in you," but, rather, "See that ye abide in Me, and see that I abide in you." Both clauses must be understood imperatively: "Abide in Me by faith, and love, and watchfulness, and see that I abide in you by your continuing in the Unity of the Faith, and by diligently using all means of grace which I have appointed to bring about My abiding in you, and ye in Me." Whether this precept meant more or less than this to the Apostles, it certainly meant (and yet means) this to the Churches founded by them. The "Abiding in Me, and I in you," cannot be considered apart from the "continuing steadfast" of Acts ii. 42—continuing steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine, in their fellowship, in the breaking of bread, and in the prayers.

"As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, no more," &c. Bearing fruit here is of course bearing Christian fruit. Are we, then, to deny that virtue and goodness are not real, and so far acceptable to God, even in the heathen? Assuredly

5 I am the vine, ye *are* the branches: He that abideth

---

not. But what the Lord means by fruit are those Christian good works and holy dispositions which support and further the kingdom of God. God has planted a Vine of grace in this world, that better, nobler, higher, purer fruits of goodness and righteousness may be produced in it than in the old degenerate vine of unrenewed and unaided human nature, and what we have to see to is, that our own works, and the works of all we can influence, are purified and consecrated to God by being done in the grace of Christ, the true Vine.

5. "I am the vine, ye are the branches." This is not a mere repetition, but an assurance that the Apostles, now that the traitor had left, were actually in Him as branches of Himself. In verse 3 He speaks generally, "Every branch that beareth not fruit," or "that beareth fruit;" then, in the next verse, He pronounced them clean through His word, and bade them abide in Him, and now He pronounces them branches. Let the reader notice this. If these eleven were branches, they were the first branches into which the Divine Stem branched out or divided itself, so that all the members of the future Church were through them connected with Him. There was afterwards another added (St. Paul), but he also came directly and visibly from the Stem itself.

"He that abideth in me, and I in him." How? Internally and externally. Internally by faith and love and secret prayer; externally, by partaking of the One Bread, and so being in the One Body (1 Cor. x. 17), and also by continuance in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in the common prayers (Acts ii. 42).

"The same bringeth forth much fruit." What is this fruit, because upon so vital a matter there should be no misconception? The first account of "much fruit" of Christian works is at the very formation and outset of the Church: "Fear (the true fear of God) came upon every soul, and all that believed were together, and had all things common, and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men . . . and they continuing daily with one accord in the Temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God." This fruit, if it be the fruit of Christ dwelling in us, must be in accordance with His teaching. It must be the fruit of the Beatitudes—humiliation, godly sorrow, meekness, earnest desires after righteous-

in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much [d] fruit: for || without me ye can do nothing.

6 If a man abide not in me, [e] he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast *them* into the fire, and they are burned.

[d] Hos. xiv. 8. Phil. i. 11. & iv. 13.

|| Or, *severed from me*, Acts iv. 12.

[e] Matt. iii. 10. & vii. 19.

5. "Without Me." "Apart from Me" (Alford and Revisers). Not as meaning, "without My aid," but "severed from Me."

6. "Gather them." Some MSS. (א, D., L.), some old Latin, Vulg. (Cod. Amiat. *eum*), Peshito, read "it" or "him;" but A., B., later Uncials, most Cursives, and some old Latin (a, b, c, f) read "them."

ness, mercifulness, peacemaking, purity of heart, enduring persecution for righteousness' sake, and for Christ's sake. It must be the fruit set forth in St. Paul's account of charity, in St. Peter's adding of virtue to virtue (2 Peter i. 5), in St. James's government of the tongue (James iii.).

"Much fruit." Though it is not expressed, yet it is clear that the amount of the fruit depends upon the closeness of the adherence, *i.e.*, on the strength of the faith and love.

"Without me ye can do nothing," *i.e.*, apart from Me. So that we should seek earnestly to adhere to Him as closely as possible, and prayerfully use every means whereby we may invite Him into us, or continue to retain Him within us.

6. "If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch." Here the Lord again repeats the terrible warning. A man once in Him has to abide in Him, and may not so do. In the face of two such warnings as these, what foolhardiness in modern fanatics encouraging those who have only just begun to be religious, to boast that they are "saved," that they need have no fear of judgment, that believers are above the sphere of judgment, and such things!

"If a man abide not in me," *i.e.*, if he takes not the pains, and exercises not the self-discipline, and uses not the means, and invites not and retains not the Holy Spirit by Which he may abide in Me.

6. "He is cast forth as a branch and is withered." First, "he is cast forth," not, of course, by death, or by open excommunication, but by the secret act or decree of God. This severs him from Christ as the fountain of grace, and then he withers, just as the branch in

7 If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, [f] ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you.

8 [g] Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear

[f] ver. 16. ch. xiv. 13, 14. & xvi. 23.

[g] Matt. v. 16. Phil. i. 11.

---

[a] "Ye shall ask." So ℵ, E., G., H., K., most Cursives, Vulg.; but A., B., D., L., M., some Cursives, some old Latin and versions read, "ask" in the imperative.

the actual vine withers if the sap cannot flow into it. He may go on making a profession, speaking well, hearing preaching, receiving Sacraments with outward reverence, but in the eye of God, and not seldom in the eyes of his fellow-Christians, he withers and is spiritually dead, and there is at last the fearful end, "they (Matthew xiii. 41) gather them and cast them into the fire, and they are burned."

7. "If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask," &c. Here, it will be noticed, the Lord begins to abandon the figure of the tree, for "my words abide in you," cannot properly be said of branches. The unconscious branch begins to disappear in the conscious person, in whom words can "abide" by memory and active obedience. But what words of Christ? All Christ's words. All must be accepted, retained, and pondered over, and acted out so far as our limited faculties will allow.

"Ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you." Why should Christ's words abiding in us be the ground of this particular promise? Evidently for this reason: the more the words of Christ abide in us by our receiving them in implicit faith, and appropriating them, the more the mind of Christ will be in us, for the words of Christ convey the mind of Christ, and the more we have of the mind of Christ the more we shall fall in with the will and purposes of God: and so our desires will be expressed in prayer to God for what He is most disposed to grant. The words of Christ abiding within us will inspire us to pray for what He wills, and what He wills His Father approves, and will bring about.

8. "Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit." "My Father is glorified in your bearing much fruit, because by sending Me into the world, and putting His words and His power in Me, and giving you to Me as branches, He has planted Me (and you in Me) as His Vine in this world, that in Me and in you as united to Me, and branching out from Me, the nature of His crea-

much fruit; [h] so shall ye be my disciples.

[h] ch. viii. 31. & xiii. 35.

---

8. "So shall ye be my disciples." So ℵ, A., E., G., H., K., S., &c., all Cursives "And become my disciples," B., D., L., M.; so Alford; *et efficiamini*, Vulg.

tures may be renewed and cleansed. And so as He has been glorified in My works, so shall He be glorified in those works which ye shall do through your union with Me." And, again, the fruitfulness of the branches sets forth the glory of the Husbandman, Who has so cleansed them as to make them the more fruitful.

"So shall ye be my disciples," *i.e.*, those in whom the idea of discipleship is perfected. This is a very pregnant saying indeed. The disciples of other teachers are those who attend their schools and learn of them. The disciples of Jesus are those who learn of Him and obey Him. Obedience is the one condition of true discipleship.

Notice also how in this way, to be a disciple of Christ is at once the lowest and the highest thing. It is the first step that we should put ourselves under the teaching of Christ, and learn of Him, and yet after we have not only learnt of Him, but have borne much fruit of our learning, it will still be that we should be His disciples. The most fruitful Apostle is still but a disciple in the school of such a Master, and the continuance in the works of his Apostleship is the condition of the continuance of his discipleship; so that no matter what our office in the Church, or our fruitfulness in that office, from beginning to end we are learners, disciples, children, even little children.

Such is the great Church parable, the parable which sets forth inherence in Christ, so that we should live by His Life. One question more: Is the relation of Christ to His people a matter of mere teaching on the one side, and mere reception of such instruction on the other? This depends upon whether certain statements in Scripture imply mere instruction, or something more. If we are honestly to endeavour to understand the Word of God, we must trace out the ideas which appear and re-appear in it from their source to their application. The characteristic phrase of this parable is the being "in Christ." The first mention of this remarkable phrase is in John vi. 56, in connection with receiving the Lord's flesh and blood. This parable of the Vine in which is the next repetition of it is delivered to the Apostles immediately upon their having received

9 As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you: continue ye in my love.

[i] ch. xiv. 15, 21, 23.

10 [i] If ye keep my commandments, ye shall

---

the Lord's Body and Blood. The next re-appearance of it is in the words of St. Paul, in 1 Cor. x. 17, setting forth the means of our continuance in the mystical body. "The bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ? . . . for we being many are one bread and one body, for we are all partakers of that one Bread." The most remarkable period of fruitfulness in the Church is associated with repentance, receiving Baptism, continuing in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in the breaking of Bread and the prayers (Acts ii. 38, 41, 42, 44); and throughout the Pauline Epistles the great truth that they are in the Mystical Body is brought to bear upon Christians that they may be fruitful in all good works, that they may be humble-minded (Rom. xii. 3, 4), pure (1 Cor. vi. 15), sympathizing with one another (1 Cor. xii. 12, 14, 26, 27), truthful (Eph. iv. 25), and even that they should be regardful of the duties of private and home life (Eph. v. 23, 33).

To "keep" the teaching of ordinary teachers, our own unaided efforts may be sufficient, but to keep the teaching of Christ there is need of very high supernatural grace, and we should gather from this parable, compared with other statements of Holy Writ, that this grace comes from His human Nature, or that His human Nature is the channel through which the Divine flows into us. This is a great thing, but not too great if we consider that He is the Word made flesh, and that "in Him dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead bodily" (Coloss. ii. 9).

9. "As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you: continue ye in my love." "*As* the Father hath loved me, *so*." Love is the same both in God and in man, for the love of all created beings is derived from the love in the Godhead. The love of the Father to the Son is reproduced in the love of the Son to mankind, and particularly to His people. All holy love must be essentially the same. But this love of Christ has to be continued in, and there is only one way to this, and that a Divine way.

10. "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as," &c. Of course, in our keeping Christ's commandments, and abiding in His love, there is a contingency—owing to the re-

abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love.

11 These things have I spoken unto you, that my joy might remain in you, and [k] *that* your joy might be full.

[k] ch. xvi. 24. & xvii. 13. 1 John i. 4.

---

11. "Might remain." So ℵ, L., X., most later Uncials and Cursives. "Might be in you," with A., B., D., several Cursives, Vulgate, and Syriacs.

mains of our evil nature we may not do so; and in our Lord's keeping His father's commandments and abiding in His love, there is no contingency, because He is in the Father, and the Father in Him; but in Him as well as in us it is the same obedience of love, not merely the same love, but the same obedience of love.

"In my love." It has been made a question if "ye shall abide in my love" means in My love towards you, or in your love towards Me; but both depend on the same thing, on obedience. Christ's love towards us depends on our continuing to obey Him, and on our part every act of disobedience weakens our love to Him.

11. "These things have I spoken unto you, that my joy might remain in you," &c. What things had He spoken? Either the whole of what He had said respecting their union with Him as branches of the true Vine, or perhaps, especially, the last two verses in which He had set forth the keeping of His commandments as the way in which they were to abide in His love. His meaning then is, "What I have spoken to you I have spoken not for obedience only, but for joy in that obedience, that we may rejoice together; that My joy in beholding your obedience may be diffused into you, and may be in you to the full, no matter what outward tribulations or afflictions ye endure." Among the many explanations given of this joy, the two most likely are, (1) that of Augustine, "What is the joy of Christ in us, except that He deigns to rejoice on behalf of us? And what is our joy, which He saith must be made full, but to have fellowship with Him?" This seems most in agreement with 1 John i. 4, where having spoken of the Incarnation, and of its having been revealed that we might have fellowship with God, and with one another, he adds, "These things write we unto you that your joy may be full." (2) The joy which He Himself experiences in feeling Himself the object of His Father's love. By obedience such joy will grow to perfect fulness. For every act of faithfulness will

12 [l] This is my commandment, That ye love one another, as I have loved you.

13 [m] Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.

14 [n] Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you.

15 Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth: but I

[l] ch. xiii. 34. 1 Thess. iv. 9. 1 Pet. iv. 8. 1 John iii. 11. & iv. 21.
[m] ch. x. 11, 15. Rom. v. 7, 8. Ephes. v. 2. 1 John iii. 16.
[n] ch. xiv. 15, 23. See Matt. xii. 50.

---

15. "Henceforth I call you not servants." "No longer I call you servants" (Alford and Revisers).

draw closer the bond between Himself and themselves, as every moment of His Life did the bond between Jesus and the Father.

12. "This is my commandment, That ye love one another," &c. "Now," says Augustine, "He had already spoken this sentence once before. The repetition of this commandment then is for enhancing it in our regard, only there He saith, 'A new commandment give I unto you;' but here, 'this is my commandment;' there [He speaks] as if no such commandment existed before; here as if no other were His commandment. True, but there it is called 'New,' that we may not preserve in our oldness; here it is called '*My* commandment' that we may not think it can be despised."

13, 14. "Greater love hath no man than this, that . . . I command you." The Lord here sets forth the greatness of His love to them. It cannot be greater, for He would die for them. What return were they to make? This, that they were to do whatsoever He commanded them; and His one commandment had been, "That ye love one another as I have loved you." It is as if He said, "I do not ask you so much to love Me, as in return for My love to show your regard by keeping My commandment, that ye should love one another even as I have loved you." Here, again, notice that there is but one test of friendship to Christ, not words, not lively feelings only, but obedience.

15. "Henceforth I call you not servants . . . I have made known unto you." We cannot help being reminded here of God's words respecting Abraham and Moses. Abraham was the friend of God: and so God says respecting him, "Shall I hide from Abraham that thing which I do?" (Gen. xviii. 17). Of Moses God said, "The Lord spake to Moses face to face, as a man speaketh to his friend"

have called you friends; [o] for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you.

16 [p] Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and [q] ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and *that* your fruit should

[o] See Gen. xviii. 17. ch. xvii. 26. Acts xx. 27.
[p] ch. vi. 70. & xiii. 18. 1 John iv. 10, 19.
[q] Matt. xxviii. 19. Mark xvi. 15. Col. i. 6.

(Exod. xxxiii. 11); and, again: "With him will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches" (Numb. xii. 8). If ever men were lifted above the state of servants, and taken into the confidence of God, it was the men who heard this discourse, and especially the outpouring of the Lord's whole soul into the ear of His Father with which it concludes. He treated them as friends, and He called them friends; but this did not prevent them ever after calling themselves, not His friends, but His slaves. St. Paul begins his greatest epistle with calling himself a slave of Jesus Christ (Rom. i. 1). So also St. James and St. Peter. The two are perfectly compatible. They were His friends because He had made known to them the counsels and plans of God. They were His slaves, because they were the purchase of His Blood. In fact, they were more than friends, they were His brethren, sons of God, having received, and retained, and been filled with, the Spirit of adoption, and yet their whole lives were spent in never-ceasing labour and endurance in the service of Himself and of His Father.

"All things that I have heard of my Father I have made known," &c. All things, that is, that they were then capable of receiving. He had many things to say to them which they could not yet bear.

16. "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you," &c. There can be little doubt but that the Lord here refers, not to their election to be His followers, or even to discipleship, but to the Apostolate. In a sense He chooses all who come to Him. With every soul He is the first to begin, even though the soul must also on its part choose Him; but if we are to be guided by other places, in which He specially mentions this choosing (as John vi. 70) it refers to His choice of them to be His Apostles. Mark also for what He chose them, that they should go (*i.e.*, to all the world), and bring forth fruit—the fruit of their toil and labour being the Christian Church; and that their fruit should remain, which it does in the permanency and indestructibility of the same Church.

remain: that [r] whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my
[r] ver. 7. ch. xiv. 13.
name, he may give it you.

[s] ver. 12.
17 [s] These things I command you, that ye love one another.

[t] 1 John iii. 1, 13.
18 [t] If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before *it hated* you.

[u] 1 John iv. 5.
19 [u] If ye were of the world, the world would
[x] ch. xvii. 14.
love his own: but [x] because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you.

20 Remember the word that I said unto you, [y] The servant
[y] Matt. x. 24. Luke vi. 40. ch. xiii. 16.
is not greater than his lord. If they have perse-

These words contain a very great principle. Christ was in no sense the choice of the people. He was the "Elect," the "Sent" of God, and the Apostles were in no sense elected by the Church, but chosen, ordained, and sent by Christ, after having been given to Him by His Father. This is the first principle of all Church rule and action, that it originally comes not from beneath, but from above.

"That whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name." The Lord's choice of them was not only that they should bear permanent fruit, but that they should put up prevailing prayer. The first and greatest instance of this was, that their united prayers brought down the Promise of the Father.

17, 18, 19. "These things I command you, that ye love," &c. "The world hateth you." "All that I have said unto you may be summed up in the one precept that ye love one another; and ye have indeed need of this love among yourselves, for the world will hate you because it has hated Me, and ye represent Me: but be not shaken in mind, or dismayed at this, rather take courage, for this hatred on the part of the world will prove to you that ye have My mark upon you, that ye are following My example, that ye are doing My work: and so ye are not of the world, but of God and of Myself."

20. "Remember the word that I said unto you . . . keep your's also." "It is not likely that you will fare better at the hands of the world than I have done; you must be prepared to experience

cuted me, they will also persecute you; [z] if they have kept my saying, they will keep your's also.

z Ezek. iii. 7.

21 But [a] all these things will they do unto you for my name's sake, because they know not him that sent me.

a Matt. x. 22. & xxiv. 9. ch. xvi. 3.

22 [b] If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin: [c] but now they have no || cloke for their sin.

b ch. ix. 41.

c Rom. i. 20. James iv. 17.

|| Or, *excuse.*

23 [d] He that hateth me hateth my Father also.

d 1 John ii. 23.

24 If I had not done among them [e] the works which none other man did, they had not had sin: but now have they both seen and hated both me and my Father.

e ch. iii. 2. & vii. 31. & ix. 32.

---

the same treatment. The mass of your countrymen will reject your words, just as they have rejected Mine; but the few, the godly remnant—those whose hearts God has prepared—will keep your sayings as they have kept Mine."

21-24. "But all these things will . . . If I had not come and spoken to them . . . no cloke for their sin . . . hateth my Father also . . . hated both me and my Father." The meaning of these verses is very clear. Jesus is the perfect manifestation of the Father in His character, His words, and His works; just as they who saw Him saw the Father, and they who loved Him loved the Father, so they who hated Him hated the Father. So that the manifestation of Jesus was that which brought out the depth of their sin, and their real hatred of God under their hypocritical zeal for His Law and His Name. Notice how the Lord, in verse 22, alludes to His words as taking away all excuse, because the words of One Who spake as never man spake; and in verse 24 alludes to His works as so manifestly done by the power and authority of the Father, as to make their rejection of Him not merely a thing without cloke or excuse, but a wilful rejection of both His Father and Himself. They saw the Witness to the Father in His mighty and beneficent works, and they actually hated what they saw, and so hated the final and conclusive testimony of God to Himself. ["Ye do alway resist the Holy Ghost, as your fathers did so do ye."] "The rejection of Jesus characterized their state as one of invincible estrange-

25 But *this cometh to pass*, that the word might be fulfilled
f Ps. xxxv. 19. & lxix. 4. that is written in their law, f They hated me without a cause.

g Luke xxiv. 49. ch. xiv. 17, 26. & xvi. 7, 13. Acts ii. 33. 26 g But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, *even* the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father,
h 1 John v. 6. h he shall testify of me:

---

ment, as hatred of God, which is, by its very nature, the unpardonable sin, and was thus distinguished from mere ignorance, as that of the heathen." (Godet.)

25. "This cometh to pass . . . they hated me without a cause." These words of the Psalmist are to be found in a strictly Messianic Psalm, and were fulfilled in Christ, *i.e.*, completely and absolutely accomplished in Him, as they were in no other man; for all other men have something in them which calls out at times our anger, or our opposition, or our dislike; but in the Lord Jesus there was nothing but pure love, earnest desire to do good, patient endurance of wrong, and so, as it could be said of no other human being, "They hated him without a cause."

26. "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you," &c. The Comforter, or the Paraclete; whatever be the full meaning of the word, it certainly seems to include what belongs to both our words Advocate and Comforter.

"Even the spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father." This promise of the coming of the Comforter seems to be given here to console and sustain the Apostles under the prospect of the hatred of the world. It must be taken with the eighth, ninth, and tenth verses of the next chapter. "The world may reject and hate Me; but there is One Whom I will send, Who, by His witness to Me, will prove it to be in the wrong. He will make manifest to it the sin of its unbelief in Me, the righteousness of all My Life, and the judgment which will overtake its prince, though he may seem for a little moment to overcome Me."

"Whom I will send unto you from the Father, . . . which proceedeth from the Father." The more this place is examined, the more it is certain that our Lord does not here intend to assert that the Holy Ghost proceeds only from the Father; for why does He mention here at all that He "proceeds from the Father"?

27 And [i]ye also shall bear witness, because [k]ye have been with me from the beginning.

[i] Luke xxiv. 48. Acts i. 8, 21, 22. & ii. 32. & iii. 15. & iv. 20, 33. & v. 32 & x. 39. & xiii. 31. 1 Pet. v. 1. 2 Pet. i. 16.
[k] Luke i. 2. 1 John i. 1, 2.

Evidently to emphasize the independence of the witness of the Spirit to Him. By saying that He Who will testify of Him proceeds from the Father, He means to assert that the Spirit will testify of the Mind and Will of the Father respecting Jesus, and so will effectually disprove the calumny of the Jews, that the Supreme God, the God of Israel, was opposed to the mission and claims of Jesus. That the Spirit of God proceeds ultimately from the Father is certain from this, that the Son Himself, from Whom He is, or proceeds, is "of the Father." So that, in proceeding from the Son, He proceeds from the Father, from Whom, and in Whom, the Son Himself is. But He is so distinctly called the Spirit of "the Son," or of "Christ" (Rom. viii. 9; Phil. i. 19; 1 Pet. i. 11), and the Lord, by his action of breathing upon the Apostles when He said to them, "receive ye the Holy Ghost," seems so clearly to indicate that the Spirit proceeds from Him also, that we cannot but gather that He is also "of the Son." Besides, the analogy of the Mission of the Son from the Father would lead us to the same conclusion. The Father is never sent; the Son is sent, because He is the Son, and so "of the Father." And so the Holy Ghost can be sent by the Son, because He is "of the Son." If, in some sense, the being of the Spirit does not depend upon that of the Son, it is hard to distinguish His mode of existence from that of a Son.

27. "And ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning." The Spirit bears witness, after His manner, spiritually; and so, directly on the heart, and mind, and conscience. The witness of the Apostles was after the manner of man. It was limited to what they had seen of the life and conduct of Jesus, and to the words they had heard Him speak; and so the Lord adds, "because ye have been with me from the beginning." The reader will remember how, when a new Apostle was chosen to fill the place of the traitor, the choice was to be from among those which "had companied with the Apostles all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among them, beginning from the Baptism of John." (Acts i. 21, 22.)

CHAP. XVI.

THESE things have I spoken unto you, that ye [a] should not be offended.

2 [b] They shall put you out of the synagogues: yea, the time cometh, [c] that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service.

3 And [d] these things will they do unto you, because they have not known the Father, nor me.

[a] Matt. xi. 6. & xxiv. 10. & xxvi. 31.
[b] ch. ix. 22, 34. & xii. 42.
[c] Acts viii. 1. & ix. 1. & xxvi. 9, 10, 11.
[d] ch. xv. 21. Rom. x. 2. 1 Cor. ii. 8. 1 Tim. i. 13.

---

2. "He doeth God service." "He offereth worship unto God" (Godet), so also Alford; "He offereth service unto God" (Revisers).

3. "Unto you" omitted by A., B., later Uncials, nearly all Cursives, old Latin (b, e, l); retained by ℵ, D., L., old Latin (a, c, f), Vulg., Syriac, and some versions.

1. "These things have I spoken unto you, that ye should not be offended." "These things:" no doubt those in the nineteenth and twentieth verses of the last chapter—that the world hateth them; that if the world has persecuted the Master, it will also persecute the disciples. With this we must include the next verse.

2. "They shall put you out of the synagogues." This implies that they would be separated from all social, as well as religious, fellowship with the outward Israel.

"Yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth", &c. One is reminded by this of the words of the Apostle: "I verily thought with myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth . . . many of the saints did I shut up in prison . . . and when they were put to death, I gave my voice against them." (Acts xxvi. 9, 10.)

"Doing God service" is a sacrificial term, and really means, in the mouth of a Jew, offering God sacrificial worship, "not merely as a good work, but as an act of sacrificial worship" (Luthardt), who also quotes a Rabbinical saying, "Whoever sheds the blood of the impious, does the same as if he offered a sacrifice." (See Exod. xxxii. 27-30; Numb. xxv. 11.)

3. "And these things will they do [unto you], because they have

4 But [e] these things have I told you, that when the time shall come, ye may remember that I told you of them. And [f] these things I said not unto you at the beginning, because I was with you.

[e] ch. xiii. 19. & xiv. 29.
[f] See Matt. ix. 15.

5 But now [g] I go my way to him that sent me; and none of you asketh me, Whither goest thou?

[g] ver. 10, 16. ch. vii. 33. & xiii. 3. & xiv. 28.

---

4. "When the time shall come." "Their time" (or "hour"), A., B., Π, 33, 124, several old Latin (b, c, e, f, g, l, q), Vulg., Syriac; "the time" (or "hour") read in ℵ, D., later Uncials, most Cursives, Cop., Arm., Æth.

not known," &c. Notice how the Lord here identifies knowing Himself with knowing the Father. This is the natural corollary of "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," and "if ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also." (xiv. 7, 9.)

4. "But these things have I told you . . . that I told you of them . . . these things I said not unto you at the beginning, because I was with you," &c. Considerable difficulty has been made of the declaration in the latter part of this verse, inasmuch as the Lord, very early in His ministry, had warned the Apostles very distinctly of what they would have to suffer, particularly in Matt. x. 16-30. Various reconciliations have been proposed, as that the Lord here speaks more distinctly of their having to suffer death for His sake; or that the discourse in Matt. x. contains sayings of our Lord not all uttered at one time, but some of them in view of His near approaching departure. But should we not look for the solution in the words, "because I was with you," which surely point to the coming of the Paraclete? The characteristic of this latest discourse of our Lord is not the persecutions of the Apostles so much as His own departure, and the coming of the Comforter. They would suffer because He would depart; but they would equally be comforted and sustained by the Paraclete also because He would depart (verse 7). And so, till the time of His departure drew nigh, and while He was yet with them, He said not these things, these mixed utterances respecting His leaving them, their consequent sufferings, and their comfort and support under them. We have only to note the amazing difference between the discourse in Matt. x. and this last discourse, to see the meaning of "These things I said not unto you at the beginning."

5, 6. "But now I go my way to him that sent me . . . sorrow hath filled your heart." These verses must be taken together. The

6 But because I have said these things unto you, [h] sorrow hath filled your heart.

7 Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, [i] the Comforter will not come unto you; but [k] if I depart, I will send him unto you.

[h] ver. 22. ch. xiv. 1.

[i] ch. vii. 39. & xiv. 16, 26. & xv. 26.

[k] Acts ii. 33. Eph. iv. 8.

Lord by the words "none of you asketh me, Whither goest thou?" followed by "sorrow hath filled your heart," gently rebuked them, in that they sorrowed with a mere human sorrow at the prospect of His leaving them, and did not take more interest in, and so eagerly inquire after, the place or sphere to which He was ascending, from which He would send the Spirit, and in which He would prepare them a place among the many mansions. They had abundance of love and affection for Him; but He desired to see more faith in the great things respecting the return to the Father, and the coming and witness of the Holy Spirit which He had been revealing to them. The questions of St. Peter (xiii. 36) and St. Thomas (xiv. 5) showed little or nothing of the faith and hope which His words ought to have worked in them.

7. "Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you," &c. What solemnity and what tenderness in these words! As if the Truth Himself said, "I know your exceeding love to Me. But I am the Truth, and I tell you the truth, though it is the hardest thing you have to receive: your very love makes it difficult to believe that My departure is your gain. But it is so. The Father has in His Wisdom so ordered all that, if I go not away, the Paraclete will not come unto you. It is in the Divine counsels that I am to send Him from the Father" ("The Spirit was not yet given [in the Lord's sojourn here], because that Jesus was not yet glorified," vii. 39). Are we permitted to see the reasons for this? In part, we are; and they are such as these. The power and Godhead of an invisible Divine Agent, such as the Holy Spirit, could not be manifested whilst the Son was visibly present. Men would ascribe all to Him Who was visible, and nothing to Him Who was invisible; in fact, they would not be able to realize His separate action. Now, the departure of the Son glorified both the Son and the Spirit. It glorified the Son, in that He was henceforth exalted into the sphere of Deity, and could now be, as He could not be

8 And when he is come, he will || reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: || Or, *convince.*

---

before, an object of faith in the sense in which the Father was (John xiv. 1); and it glorified the Spirit, inasmuch as, through Him, the Son was present, and through His powerful working in the souls or spirits of men, the teaching of the Son was understood, and made effectual to all purposes of salvation. The difference in their apprehensions of the Person and work of Christ by the Apostles after Pentecost was the proof of the Almighty Power of the Holy-Ghost over all spirits. So that the departure of the Son, and the coming of the Spirit was needful to the complete manifestation of the ever-Blessed Trinity. Again, the Holy Spirit was given in His fulness to the Human Nature of Christ, and sent down by Christ from that human nature, in order that He might be the Channel through which we partake of the Lord's glorified Humanity.

8, 9, 10, 11. "And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin . . . prince of this world is judged." "He will convince" [or convict]. The word "convince" in the matter of such a thing as sin includes the idea of reproof. The existence of sin, or of what is morally wrong in a man, is of itself a reproof of him. "Convince" is also the English word most consonant with the second and third things of which the world is convinced, viz., righteousness and judgment. The world can scarcely be "reproved" of judgment, but it can be convinced both of the necessity and certainty of judgment.

I cannot help thinking that this promise respecting the Comforter has been considered exceptionally difficult, because its first historical fulfilment on the day of Pentecost has not been sufficiently taken into account.

On that day all these three convictions did take place, and in the manner here predicted.

Men were then convinced of sin because they were "pricked in their heart," and this because they or their fellow-countrymen had not believed in Christ, but "with wicked hands had crucified and slain" Him (Acts ii. 23). They were convinced of righteousness, *i.e.*, of His perfect righteousness, because they saw before them the evident signs that He was exalted to the right hand of God, and that "God had made that same Jesus Whom they had crucified, both Lord and Christ." This they were convinced of because they

[1] Acts ii. 22-37. 9 [1]Of sin, because they believe not on me;

no longer saw Him, but saw the evident signs of His exaltation to the highest place in heaven. And they were convinced of judgment, that they would be judged each one personally, that "the axe is laid unto the root of the trees," and this conviction made them flee as they had never done before at the preaching of either the Baptist or of Jesus Himself, from the wrath to come. But how was this last conviction brought about through their belief that the prince of this world was judged? Evidently by these steps: Being convinced of their sin in not having believed on Him as the Son of God, and the true Messiah; being convinced by the signs they saw that He was not only a righteous man, but the righteousness of God as set forth in His true and perfect image, they must of necessity have believed that His condemnation was from Satan, that the hour of His Crucifixion and Death was "the hour of the power of darkness," and that His conquest over death and consequent Ascension to the right Hand of God was the guarantee that Satan was already dethroned. If Satan could not keep Jesus in the grave, he must himself be conquered. The stronger Man had come upon the strong and overcome him, and was taking from him all his armour wherein he trusted. And if Satan is judged, so will those who belong to him, and so the Apostle on the day of Pentecost applied to them the words of the Psalmist, "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit Thou on My right hand till I make Thine enemies Thy footstool," and he bade them save themselves without delay from that untoward generation.

Such was undoubtedly the first and great fulfilment of this promise. Simple though it seems and strangely in contrast with more high-flown and intellectual explanations, it is in such sort the fulfilment that without it there could have been no other. The words of the Lord are capable of almost infinite expansion, but the Pentecostal fulfilment is the ground and root of all.

Let us now consider the further and more universal application.

"Of sin, because they believe not on me." The Jews who believed on the day of Pentecost were not only convinced that the rejection of Jesus on their part, and on that of their countrymen, had been a great sin in itself, but that it was also the symptom of a still more sinful state of heart; their doing evil had made them "hate the light," so that they "came not to the light;" they heard not the

10 [m] Of righteousness, [n] because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more;

[m] Acts ii. 32.
[n] ch. iii. 14. & v. 32.

10. "My Father." "The Father," so ℵ, B., D., L., some Cursives, old Latin (mostly), Vulg. "My Father" read by A., later Uncials, almost all Cursives, and Syriac.

words of God in the words of Jesus because they themselves were "not of God" (John iii. 20, viii. 47).

And so it is with all rejection of the claims of Christ as a Saviour from sin, whether that rejection be formal, as in the case of the infidel, or virtual, as in the case of the indifferent nominal Christian. If a man who hears of Christ as a Saviour from sin and a Giver of Life, does not believe in Christ as such and does not apply to Him for forgiveness and life, his want of realizing belief is sinful in itself, and an indication of the secret power which sin or the world has over him.

10. "Of righteousness, because I go to my Father," &c. The Jew who was, on the day of Pentecost, pricked to the heart and made to believe in Jesus, was convinced of His righteousness because God had removed Him from the world, and set Him at His right hand, the proof of which was in the Pentecostal effusion of the Spirit and the wonders it wrought. But if the Jew was convinced of this, if he would follow up this conviction he would realize that the righteousness of Christ was the only standard of true righteousness. It is saying very little indeed to assert that this standard was more than an outward law, such as the Jewish. It was the standard of the Beatitudes, the standard of humiliation, self-surrender, self-denial, self-abasement. It was the standard to which the first Christians attempted to live, and their success in coming up to it is described in Acts ii.

But, besides this, the first Christians were convinced because Christ had gone to His Father, that this righteousness was attainable. The Pentecostal descent of the Spirit from the ascended Christ was, according to the prophecy, a shower of righteousness; the heavens rained down righteousness (Isaiah xlv. 8). The believer was convinced by the Ascension of Christ that He was now the Head of a body, to which by joints and bands He could communicate His own life to be in each member a source of strength to do righteousness (Rom. viii. 1, 4; Coloss. ii. 19).

The third conviction by the Spirit, "of judgment, because the

o Acts xxvi. 18.
p Luke x. 18. ch. xii. 31. Eph. ii. 2. Col. ii. 15. Heb. ii. 14.

11 °Of judgment, because the ᵖprince of this world is judged.

prince of this world is judged," is easy enough in its application to the great event of Pentecost and to the events immediately following it, but its universal application as a great general truth is difficult, and grows more so as unbelief in the powers of the unseen world increases. We could easily understand how the Spirit convinces the world of judgment if we could disjoin it from the reason given by the Lord, "because the prince of this world is judged." We can understand that even the world, *i.e.*, human society, has a far better standard by which to judge actions than it had before the coming of Christ. We are referred to the mitigation of the horrors of war, by the care for the sick and wounded; to the gradual extinction of slavery; to the greater respect for women; the abolition of such things as gladiatorial shows; but there seems but an indirect connection between these better judgments and the judging and condemning of the prince of this world. I do not think it is possible to realize fully the reason given by the Lord, unless we could call back our faith in the fact (for no matter whether we believe it or not, a fact it is) that between man and God there is an unseen universe of good and evil spirits. Both these hosts, both those on the side of God and those against Him, seem growing dimmer and dimmer even to the eye of a faith which still seems to apprehend the Trinity and the Incarnation. It sounds strange to us to be told that the Spirit will reprove the world of judgment because the prince of this world is judged, just as it sounds strange to us to be told, even by the Lord Himself, that the reason why we must not despise little ones is that their angels do always behold His Father's face, or by St. Paul, that one of the articles of the Mystery of Godliness is, that He Who was manifest in the flesh was "seen of angels." But in our Lord's day the unseen world and its powers was an accepted fact. He Himself, Who alone knew all its secrets, treated it as a reality. He prophesied of His condemnation and crucifixion in the words, "The prince of this world cometh," and He also prophesied that in that very hour, the hour of his supposed victory, the prince of this world should be cast out. The triumphs of the Gospel, then, on and after Pentecost, were, in His eyes, not so much the diffusion of better principles, or the esta-

12 I have yet many things to say unto you, [q] but ye cannot bear them now.

13 Howbeit when he, the [r] Spirit of truth, is come, [s] he will guide you into all truth: for he

[q] Mark iv. 33. 1 Cor. iii. 2. Heb. v. 12.
[r] ch. xiv. 17. & xv. 26.
[s] ch. xiv. 26. 1 John ii. 20, 27.

13. "Into all truth;" rather, "into all the truth."

blishment of a purer religion, or even the conversion to Himself of so many souls, but the transference of those souls from one kingdom to another, from the kingdom of Satan to that of God's Son (Coloss. i. 13). The world and the Church were, in the eyes of Him Who saw things as they are, antagonistic kingdoms, so that the setting up of the Church in Satan's world was his virtual dethronement. If the prince had his throne shaken and so was judged, in the sense of being condemned, so would his subjects be. A power—a moral and spiritual power—had come into the world, which not only by the contrast which it brought out between moral good and evil judged heathenism, but by its gradual conquest of its strongholds, gave a pledge of its final downfall.

12. "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." This implies that though He could not say them then, He could say them hereafter, when they were in a fit state to receive all, and so no difference must be made (as has been made) between the things taught by Christ orally, and the things which He taught afterwards by His Spirit. One of these things which they could not then bear was the Atonement by His Death. His Death as a propitiatory sacrifice could not be freely spoken of till His Resurrection had proved that God had accepted it, and His Ascension had given Him the power of applying it as our High Priest on the throne of God. Till the time of His Ascension, He was "straitened" in speaking of such a truth. After that He so spake of it through His Spirit to the Apostles, that it was the first principle of their teaching. His Headship over the Church, His Mystical Body, must also be reserved to the Ascension, when He was exalted to be the Head of that Body. The equality of the Gentiles with the Jews also, was another thing which, long after Pentecost, the very Apostles had a difficulty in "bearing."

13. "Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all [the] truth." As in the English, so in the Greek, the

shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, *that* shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come.

---

masculine personal pronoun is made to agree with the neuter noun. Properly, it should be "It" the Spirit of Truth, but to emphasize the Personality of the Spirit it is "He" [ἐκεῖνος τὸ πνεῦμα].

"He shall guide you into all the truth." Not merely teach it to you, but guide you into it, so that ye may see it from within, and not from without. This truth is not, of course, scientific, or even political truth: God leaves things which are within the reach of the due use of our natural faculties, to be attained by such use of what He has given to us, but it is all *the* truth—all the truth as it is in Jesus, the truth of the Gospel and of the Church.

"For he shall not speak of himself." The "for" here, signifies that He will guide into all the truth, because He proceeds from the Source of all truth, the Father.

"He shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak." This is not said as if the Spirit knew not the full truth: for "The Spirit searcheth all things, even the deep things of God," or as if He had not power or ability to declare it, for "He divideth to every man severally as He will;" but in order to convince the Apostles that He would not be an independent Teacher, a Teacher apart from God or Christ, Who would teach them different things from what Christ had taught them. It is a declaration by the Lord's own lips that, as it was with Him so would it be with the Spirit. He, the Son of God, had not spoken of Himself, but whatsoever He had heard or had learned of the Father, that He spake; so the Spirit should not speak of Himself, but whatsoever He should hear in the councils of the Trinity, that would He speak; so that though the Person might be another, the word would be the same.

"And he will shew you things to come." This seems said as adding something to the "all" truth of the former clause. He shall not only teach you the truth respecting My Person and work, but He shall be the Spirit of Prophecy within you, revealing to you the future. This took place when St. Paul foretold the coming of the Man of Sin, or Lawless One, and when St. John was inspired to write the visions of the future which are given to us in the Apocalypse.

14. "He shall glorify me: for he shall receive [or take] of mine,

14 He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew *it* unto you.

---

14. "Shall shew." More properly, "tell" or "announce;" Revisers, "declare."

and shall shew it unto you." "He shall glorify me." Notice how the Spirit comes to glorify the Son, just as the Son took no glory to Himself, but ascribed all glory to the Father. See how the Persons of the Godhead seek to do honour One to Another. The Father commits all judgment to the Son, "that all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father." (Ch. v. 22, 23.) The Son seeks not His own glory, but the glory of Him that sent Him. (vii. 18, viii. 50.) The Holy Ghost comes to glorify the Son.

"He shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you." What are the things or truths of Christ which the Spirit took and showed to the Apostles, and now takes and shows to the spirit of each believer? Evidently His true and proper Sonship, His Incarnation, His submission to God, the holiness of His Life, the spiritual meaning of His Miracles, the searching and illuminating power of His words, His Death and Passion and its sacrificial value in cleansing our consciences, the power of His Resurrection in that it is the means whereby His very nature is diffused into us, His Ascension that He may be our Forerunner, our Advocate, our Mediator, and the exalted Head of His Mystical Body, His Second Coming, at which, no matter what men say, believers and unbelievers alike will have to stand before Him, to receive the things done in their bodies. (2 Cor. v. 10.) Again, those mysterious things which we call Sacraments, which He ordained on such solemn occasions, and set forth in such unique and startling words, are things of Christ and the instruments of the Spirit, whereby He makes us partakers of the Lord's glorified humanity. These, then, the Spirit must take and show to us, so that we humbly accept His own words respecting them without gainsaying, and humbly hope in the right use of them to receive the promises He has made to us in them.

These all are the things of Christ which the Spirit takes and shows to the soul, but the soul has to submit to receive each particular of these things, and not allow its prejudices, or the fear of those around it, or its rooted preference of the seen to the unseen, to turn it away from what the Spirit would show or declare to it.

15 [t] All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall shew *it* unto you.

16 [u] A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again, a little while, and ye shall see me, [w] because I go to the Father.

17 Then said *some* of his disciples among themselves, What is this that he saith unto us, A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again, a little while, and ye shall see me: and, Because I go to the Father?

[t] Matt. xi. 27. ch. iii. 35. & xiii. 3. & xvii. 10.

[u] ver. 10. ch. vii. 33. & xiii. 33. & xiv. 19.

[w] ver. 28. ch. xiii. 3.

---

16. "Because I go to the Father" omitted by ℵ, B., D., L., some old Latin (a, b, e); retained by A., later Uncials, almost all Cursives, some old Latin (c, f, g), Vulg., Syriac, and versions.

15. "All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore," &c. What are the things which belong to the Father, as the Father, which are also the Son's? Evidently His providential rule over all things; His pastoral care of Israel as His Flock; above all, His authority as the Supreme Ruler to exercise Universal Judgment. These, which are inherently the Father's, He has given to the Son to execute in His stead, and so the Spirit shows the Son to be the doer of these things.

16. "A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again, a little while," &c. Here the Lord seems to pass on from the Spirit, showing unto them the things which belong to the Son, to the same Spirit showing unto them the Son Himself. The verse has apparently a double meaning. "A little while, and ye shall not behold me;" that is, while I am in the grave ye shall not behold Me with the fleshly eye; "and again, a little while, and ye shall see Me," that is, "After I am risen I will appear to you, and ye shall see Me more perfectly, realizing Who I am; but when I send the Spirit, ye shall see Me with far more clearness still, for ye shall then see Me with your spiritual eye, and this sight of Me will be your spiritual life, your power to overcome the world, your fulness of joy; and all this 'because I go to the Father.' As long as I am with you, ye cannot see Me spiritually and effectually; when I go to the Father, ye can and ye shall."

17, 18. "Then said some of his disciples . . . we cannot tell what

18 They said therefore, What is this that he saith, A little while? we cannot tell what he saith.

19 Now Jesus knew that they were desirous to ask him, and said unto them, Do ye enquire among yourselves of that I said, A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again, a little while, and ye shall see me?

20 Verily, verily, I say unto you, That ye shall weep and lament, but the world shall rejoice: and ye shall be sorrowful, but your sorrow shall be turned into joy.

---

he saith." This account of the questioning of the disciples among themselves is particularly and fully noticed, and is very important, as showing that there was among the Apostles as a body no clear idea of either the Lord's Resurrection or of the spiritual sight of Him after His departure. This shows how utterly unable they were of themselves to inaugurate the spiritual system which commenced at Pentecost, of which system the outward absence and real presence of the Lord was the greatest truth.

19. "Now Jesus knew that they were desirous," &c. He knew by His discernment of the thoughts of all hearts that they were desirous to ask Him, but had not the courage, for they must have been conscious that if they had had more implicit faith in what He said of His approaching departure by death, and His return, they would have had no need to ask Him. He had had to blame them for the culpable ignorance manifested by some former questions (xiv. 7, 8, 9), and they naturally shrank from further reproof.

20. "Verily, I say unto you, That ye shall weep and lament . . . into joy." Notice that the Lord does not give them any further knowledge of the outward facts, but speaks only of the inward feelings which His departure and return would excite: "Ye shall weep and lament, because of what ye shall see Me suffer, or shall hear of My suffering, because also of your unfaithfulness to Me, and because of the extinguishing of all your earthly hopes. But the world shall rejoice: My enemies will think that they have got rid of Me, and so they shall rejoice in their carnal security . . . 'but your sorrow shall be turned into joy.'" This joy began when the disciples "were glad when they saw the Lord," but the consummation of joy was at Pentecost; then they joyed before God

21 [x] A woman when she is in travail hath sorrow, because her hour is come: but as soon as she is delivered of the child, she remembereth no more the anguish, for joy that a man is born into the world.

22 [y] And ye now therefore have sorrow: but I will see you again, and [z] your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you.

[x] Is. xxvi. 17.

[y] ver. 6.

[z] Luke xxiv. 41, 52. ch. xiv. 1, 27, & xx. 20. Acts ii. 46. & xiii. 52. 1 Pet. i. 8.

"according to the joy of harvest, and as men rejoice when they divide the spoil."

21. "A woman when she is in travail hath sorrow . . . born into the world." The one point in the comparison is the change from very acute but transitory sorrow to very deep and abiding joy. The pains of a woman in travail last, at the worst, but a comparatively short time, and the joy is permanent. There is no other earthly sorrow which has so certain, as well as so speedy a termination in abiding satisfaction, and this explanation is quite sufficient to account for the use of such a figure. If we are to inquire into what the birth signifies, I think the most likely explanation is the Church, which was really born on the day of Pentecost. The Lord, though He appeared after His Resurrection, was soon taken from them, but the Church remained. The next verse,

22. "Ye now therefore have sorrow: but I will see you again," &c., seems to militate against this, but the difficulty arising from this vanishes when we consider that the Resurrection, the Ascension, and the coming of the Holy Ghost were virtually one event, the Resurrection being the glorification of the Lord as the conqueror of death. The Resurrection is the beginning of the Regeneration, taking the word in its fullest sense. The force of the comparison, however, is the acuteness of pain succeeded so soon by the fulness of joy.

"Your joy no man taketh from you." Wicked men had for a time taken away their joy by the cruel death of their Lord, but after Pentecost bitter persecution would only make them rejoice the more, and so we read of these very men, now so sorrowful and so timid, that "they departed from the presence of the council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for the name" (Acts v. 41).

23 And in that day ye shall ask me nothing. [a] Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give *it* you.

[a] Matt. vii. 7. ch. xiv. 13. & xv. 16.

24 Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name: ask, and ye shall receive, [b] that your joy may be full.

[b] ch. xv. 11.

25 These things have I spoken unto you in ‖ proverbs: but the time cometh, when I shall no

‖ Or, *parables*.

---

23. "Ye shall ask the Father in my name, He will give it you." MSS. of Neutral Text, ℵ, B., C., L., reverse the clauses—"He will give it you in My name." There seems no appreciable difference in the sense. Whatsoever the Father gives, He gives in the name of Christ, just as all Christians ask for what they pray for in the Same Name.

23. "And in that day ye shall ask me nothing . . . He will give it you." The first of these "asks" signifies to ask questions for information, and is the same word as that in verse 19: "Now Jesus knew that they were desirous to ask him," &c. He would no longer be at hand to give them a verbal answer; but they would not need this, because they would have a new and spiritual sense, by which all mysteries would be made plain to them. These illuminations would be from within, and would be given in answer to devout meditation on Divine Truth. The second "ask," however ("ask, and ye shall receive"), means to prefer requests as in prayer. The connection seems to be natural. Asking questions would be asking for the truth, not out of curiosity, but that they might feed upon it themselves, and make it known to others; and the idea of this would lead to asking in prayer for all things needful for their work. Godet explains the connection as if the same presence of the Spirit within them, which would illuminate them so that they need ask questions respecting nothing, would confer on them the new faculty of prayer in the name of Jesus.

24. "Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name," &c. Hitherto they had not realized Him as the One Mediator, because He was not yet exalted to His Mediatorial Throne. Now, knowing this, they would look to receive all things through Him.

25. "These things have I spoken unto you in proverbs [or parables]: but . . . of the Father." "These things in parables." All that the Lord had said, no matter how plain, was necessarily

more speak unto you in ‖ proverbs, but I shall shew you
‖ Or, *parables.* plainly of the Father.

c ver. 23. 26 [c] At that day ye shall ask in my name: and I say not unto you, that I will pray the Father for you:

d ch. xiv. 21, 23. e ver. 30. ch. iii. 13. & xvii. 8. 27 [d] For the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and [e] have believed that I came out from God.

---

27. "That I came out from God." So ℵ, A., later Uncials, Cursives, old Latin, Vulg., some Syriac, Arm., Æth.; but B., C., D., L., X., 77, 249, Copt., Syriac (Schaaf) read, "the Father."

enigmatical to them in their then state of faith and knowledge. Even things which they thought they understood, they realized but very imperfectly. The Lord, knowing this, said explicitly that what He had said was "in parables." Not only was this true of such similitudes as the Vine and its branches, but of His going away and coming again: of their asking Him nothing, and yet receiving all in His Name.

"But the time cometh, when I shall no more . . . but I shall shew you plainly of the Father." The teaching by the Holy Ghost was the only perfectly plain teaching, the meaning of which could not be mistaken. It is the office of the Spirit alone to speak in language really commensurate with the truth. All teaching in words is but a parable, until the Spirit explains it.

26, 27. "At that day ye shall ask . . . that I came out from God." This is as if He had said, "Do not think that when I speak of interceding for you with the Father, I am interceding with One Who is unwilling to grant what I ask for you. It is not so. The Father is willing to grant all that I ask on your behalf, or that you ask through Me, for He Himself, the Father, loveth you because ye have loved Me."

"Have believed that I came out from God." In other words, the Father loved the disciples of Jesus, not simply because they loved Him, but because of their Faith in His Origin and Mission. They believed that He came forth from God. Their love by itself could only be the human affection of the disciples to the Master; but their faith honoured Him as Divine, and honoured the love of the Father in sending Him.

28 [f]I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father.

[f] ch. xiii. 3.

29 His disciples said unto him, Lo, now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no ‖ proverb.

‖ Or, *parable*.

30 Now are we sure that [g]thou knowest all things, and needest not that any man should ask

[g] ch. xxi. 17.

---

28. "From the Father." (Παρὰ τοῦ Πατρός). So ℵ, A., later Uncials and Cursives; but B., C., L., &c., read, "out of" (ἐκ).

28. "I came forth from [out of] the Father, and am come into the world: again," &c. These are the crowning words of this, the Lord's farewell, the words which follow being in answer to a remark by the disciples. They express all that He asked them then to believe; and, in the thanksgiving prayer, He returns thanks to the Father that they had believed this. (xvii. 8, 25.) To believe that He came out from the Father, and, after His mission was fulfilled, returned to the Father, implied the acknowledgment of the truth of all that He had said, and the efficacy to the salvation of the world of all that He suffered. And so it is a fitting conclusion to these last words of Jesus to His own.

29. "His disciples said unto him . . . . and speakest no proverb." The disciples thought, because the Lord's words were so very plain, that they understood all; but, as Augustine says: "They did not so much as understand that they understand them not. For they were babes, and did not spiritually discern what they heard of things pertaining not to body, but to spirit."

30. "Now are we sure that thou knowest all things . . . camest forth from God." What had the Lord said which led to this exclamation? Evidently throughout this discourse He had answered the thoughts of their hearts. He had met their secret fears, their worst forebodings with such assurances as that they were in the Father's love because they loved Him, the Son of God.

"And needest not that any man should ask thee." They had been desirous to ask Him what He meant by "ye shall not see Me," and "ye shall see Me," and He had anticipated the question, and had answered, not so much the question itself, as the fear and despondency which had inspired it; and so they were conscious how very deeply He read all within them, so that He had no

thee: by this [h] we believe that thou camest forth from God.

31 Jesus answered them, Do ye now believe?

32 [i] Behold, the hour cometh, yea, is now come, that ye shall be scattered, [k] every man to ‖ his own, and shall leave me alone: and [l] yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me.

33 These things I have spoken unto you, that [m] in me ye might have peace. [n] In the world ye shall

h ver. 27. ch. xvii. 8.
i Matt. xxvi. 31. Mark xiv. 27.
k ch. xx. 10.
‖ Or, *his own home.*
l ch. viii. 29. & xiv. 10, 11.
m Is. ix. 6. ch. xiv. 27. Rom. v. 1. Eph. ii. 14. Col. i. 20.
n ch. xv. 19, 20, 21. 2 Tim. iii. 12.

---

31. "Do ye now believe?" Some, as Alford, read this as an affirmation, not a question—"Ye do now believe." It seems, however, so rendered, to yield not so good a sense.

32. "Is now come." "Now" omitted by ℵ, A., B., C., L.; but retained by old Latin, later Uncials, and Cursives.

33. "Ye shall have tribulation." ℵ, A., B., C., L., later Uncials, Cursives, and versions read, "Ye have;" D., old Latin, Vulg., read, "Ye shall have."

need to be asked. Before they asked He could answer. What they were themselves scarcely conscious of within themselves, He knew.

"By this we believe that thou camest forth from God."

31, 32. "Jesus answered them, Do ye now believe? Behold, the hour cometh," &c. As if He said, "Do ye now believe that I came forth from God? How is it then that you will desert and forsake One Whom ye confess to have 'come from God?'" The Lord does not deny the fact that they had faith, but He desires to warn them (as He had warned Peter) of its extreme weakness.

"And yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me." He had said this before (viii. 29), now He says it again; for the desertion by His own disciples brought before Him that ineffable Presence of the Father which could never leave Him, even though, for a brief moment, He seemed to be unconscious of it.

33. "These things have I spoken unto you, that in me ye might have peace." As if He said, "Do not be utterly cast down, though I question the strength and heartiness of your faith. I know all that will come, and so I have spoken all these things about My departure, your grief, My return in and through the Comforter, the love of the Father to you because ye have loved Me,—all these have I spoken that in Me ye might have a secret peace wherewith to meet the

have tribulation: [o] but be of good cheer: [p] I have overcome the world.

[o] ch. xiv. 1.
[p] Rom. viii. 37. 1 John iv. 4. & v. 4.

persecution of the world. Be not cast down, I have overcome the world. I have not been carried away for one instant by its applause. I have not been moved from My path ever so little by its opposition. Be of good cheer, for the Spirit within Me which has overcome the world shall be in you. I Myself will be in you, and so 'greater is He that is in you than he that is in the world.'"

CHAP. XVII.

THESE words spake Jesus, and lifted up his eyes to

Various names have been given to the deep and mysterious, and yet most loving and submissive utterance which follows. It has been called the prayer of the Son of God, as being His prayer which He said on behalf of Himself and His own, as distinguished from the prayer which He taught us to say on behalf of ourselves. It has been called the Great High Priestly prayer—the great Intercession; it has been called the Prayer of Consecration, as hallowing and setting apart His chosen ones for the work which He was now leaving in their hands. But can it be called a prayer? Is it not rather an act of free communion with God, of holy intercourse with the Father? Even in those parts which are supplicatory, the supplication is that of One Who is the equal of Him to Whom the supplication is addressed, and yet subordinate to Him; and the greater part by far is not prayer, but converse, the converse of One Who is in the same sphere with Him with Whom He converses. It is dutiful, submissive, reverential, and yet it is the utterance of One Who could say, "Father, glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee." "Glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." All throughout it is in marvellous accord with every other word of the Son of God throughout this Gospel. In it there speaks the true and

heaven, and said, Father, [a] the hour is come; glorify thy
[a] ch. xii. 23. & xiii. 32.
Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee:

---

1. "Also" omitted by ℵ, A., B., C., D., old Latin (a, b, c, f, g), Vulg., Syriac, and versions; retained by L., later Uncials, and most Cursives.
"Thy" omitted by ℵ, B., C., and some old Latin; retained by A., L., later Uncials, Cursives, old Latin (a, b, c, f, g), Vulg.

proper and only Son, and yet the obedient Son whose "meat and drink it is to do the will of Him that sent Him." It is the utterance of One Who did nothing of Himself, Who sought not His own glory, Who ascribed all, even the very gift of His chosen ones, to God, and yet was fully conscious that all men must honour Him, even as they honour the Father, if the Father Himself is to have the honour due to Him.

Nowhere else is the veil drawn up from before the relation of two Persons of the Godhead to one another. In no other place are we allowed to hear the secret converse of Deity. Elsewhere we are told of the love between the Father and the Son. Here is the expression of it.

1. "Lifted up his eyes to heaven." So did He when He brake the loaves, and blessed them. So did He when He raised up Lazarus.

"The hour is come." The hour of His deepest humiliation and sorrow; and close following upon it, as if it were but one event, the hour of His triumph over death, and His Ascension.

"Glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee." Glorify Him by bringing Him triumphantly through the darkest valley of the shadow of death to His glorious Resurrection and Ascension, and the Descent of the Holy Ghost. The latter, if we are to hold in due regard this saying in chap. xvi., "He shall glorify Me, for He shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you," is especially meant here. The Son of God was to glorify the Father by drawing all hearts to Himself, and so to the Father. Through knowing the Son by the Holy Ghost being given to them, men were to know the Father. The reader will remember the words of St. Paul (Phil. ii. 9), "God hath highly exalted him, and given him the name that is above every name . . . that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow . . . and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

2 [b] As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many [c] as thou hast given him.

3 And [d] this is life eternal, that they might

[b] Dan. vii. 14. Matt. xi. 27. & xxviii. 18. ch. iii. 35. & v. 27. 1 Cor. xv. 25, 27. Phil. ii. 10. Heb. ii. 8.
[c] ver. 6, 9, 24. ch. vi. 37.
[d] Is. liii. 11. Jer. ix. 24.

---

2. "As many as thou hast given him." "That whatsoever thou hast given Him, to them He should give" (Alford and Revisers); *ut omne quod dedisti ei, det eis vitam æternam* (Vulg.).

2. "As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give," &c. Had this power then been already given to Him, or was the gift reserved till He ascended? All in the councils of the ever-blessed Trinity had been already given, but at the Ascension the gift took effect and was made manifest. The "as" denotes the sequence thus: the Son glorifies the Father by exercising that power over all flesh which issues in the gift of eternal life to as many as God has given to Him. "That he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given to him." The structure of the sentence is peculiar, and our English translation scarcely gives its true meaning. It should be literally rendered, "That whatsoever (*i.e.*, πᾶν, "all," looked upon as one thing), Thou hast given to Him, to them (*i.e.*, to each individual of the whole that will receive it) He should give eternal life." The idea is not that of a narrowing, excluding predestination; on the contrary, it is that of (so to speak) a large trunk, or body, or whole, to the various parts of which the Son is to give eternal life. [See particularly note on page 163, on chap. vi. 39, and quotation from Cyril there.]

3. "And this is life eternal, that they might know thee," &c. Life eternal is knowledge, but not intellectual knowledge, such as we can have of words, or things, or ideas, or processes; but that knowledge which persons have of one another, when one can say of another, "I know him," "I know him so that I should converse with him, and learn his thoughts and will, and have intercourse with him as one soul can have with another."

"Thee, the only true God." This designation of the Father comes naturally after the acknowledgment, "Thou hast given him power over *all* flesh." All flesh must comprehend the multitudes

know thee [e] the only true God, and Jesus Christ, [f] whom thou hast sent.

[e] 1 Cor. viii. 4. 1 Thess. i. 9.
[f] ch. iii. 34. & v. 36, 37. & vii. 29, 57. & viii. 29. & x. 36. & xi. 42.

3. "Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." "And Him Whom Thou didst send, even Jesus Christ" (Alford and Revisers).

who were worshipping false gods, and so the Lord here sets forth life eternal to be the intimate and personal knowledge of the One true God, the Father, not as excluding the other two Divine Persons, but as including them, for the Father being the Fountain of Deity, includes in Himself the Son, Who is of Him and from Him, and the Holy Ghost, by Whom both the Father and the Son are known and seen.

"And Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." Compare with this, "ye believe in God, believe also in me," and "I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me."

The first recognition of Jesus as the Christ was that He was the sent of God. They who firmly and savingly believed this, had in them the root of all further acknowledgment of Him as the Messiah, the Son of God, and the Lord and God, because, as I said, it is not possible to suppose that God would send as His special messenger anyone who would exaggerate or misrepresent his relations to God.

Exception has been taken to the use of the words "Jesus Christ" by the Lord as a designation of Himself. Some Rationalists, who wish to get rid of the truth of this Gospel, assert that it would have been impossible at that time for the Lord to have called Himself by this united name and title; and others think that the Evangelist must here have given a gloss on the Lord's words rather than the words themselves; but such expositors seem to forget that St. Peter within two months after this said to the Jews, "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ" (Acts ii. 36), and, a few days after, this very collocation, "He shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you" (Acts iii. 20).

The "knowing" Jesus Christ is the knowing Him as the Prophet, Priest, and King of His people; learning of Him as the Pro

4 [g]I have glorified thee on the earth: [h]I have finished the work [i]which thou gavest me to do.

[g] ch. xiii. 31. & xiv. 13.
[h] ch. iv. 34. & v. 36. & ix. 3. & xix. 30.
[i] ch. xiv. 31. & xv. 10.

4. "I have finished." "Having accomplished; ' so ℵ, A., B., C., L., some Cursives (1, 33, 42, 122, 246), and versions; but later Uncials, nearly all Cursives, old Latin (a, c, e, f, g), Vulg., and Syriac (Peshito), as in Rec. Text.

phet, coming to God through Him as the Priest, obeying Him, and being loyal to Him as the King.

4. "I have glorified thee on the earth, I have finished (or, by finishing) the work which thou gavest me to do." It has been asked, "How could the Saviour say this, seeing that His great work of atoning sacrifice on the Cross was not begun? After that work was over He said, 'It is finished.'"

The answer is, that He no doubt distinguished between His active work whilst living amongst men, and His sufferings when dying. He had a certain work to do before He died to expiate sin. He had said, "I must work the works of Him that sent me whilst it is day" (ix. 4). It is very remarkable that the earliest liturgy which has come down to us, in citing this place, makes this distinction: "He was holy in His conversation, and taught according to the law; He cured diseases, and wrought signs and wonders among the people; He manifested Thy Name to them that knew it not; He dispelled the cloud of ignorance, restored piety, fulfilled Thy will, and finished the work which Thou gavest Him to do. And when He had regulated all these things, He was seized by the hands of a disobedient people and wicked men abusing the office of priests," &c. In other words, His work, whilst living amongst us, was to manifest the character of God in His conversation, the power and beneficence of God in His miracles, and the wisdom of God in His discourses.

We know also that one most important part of His work, if not the chief part, was to retain those whom God had given to Him, to augment their faith, and to wean them from the world. As He says afterwards, "While I was with them in the world, I kept them in Thy name," "Those whom thou gavest me I have kept," "For their sakes I sanctify myself."

There is something very mysterious in the way in which the Lord

5 And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory [k] which I had with thee before the world was.

[k] ch. i. 1, 2. & x. 30. & xiv. 9. Phil. ii. 6. Col. i. 15, 17. Heb. i. 3, 10.

communes with His Father respecting these chosen Apostles. Assuredly, in His own eyes, and in that of His Father's, there was that in them which made the members of this small band a necessity, if one may so say, to the Church. They were not merely the founders of the Church, but the Church itself,—certainly the unity and the ministry of the Church was in them, or there is no meaning in some of the most remarkable words of this prayer.

Many commentators think that the Lord in saying, "I have finished the work," speaks in anticipation of His sufferings, but are we not forced by many sayings of His to distinguish between the work He had to do before He could suffer, and His subsequent sufferings?

5. "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory," &c. This verse may be rendered, "And now glorify Thou me, O Father, by the side of Thyself, with the glory which I had before the world was, by Thy side." "With Thee" unquestionably means "in the same sphere, or place, as Thou art—on Thy throne, at Thy right hand." The Lord here asks that the Divine glory which He shared with the Father, before He emptied Himself of it by becoming incarnate (Phil. ii. 7) may now be given back to Him in the nature which He had assumed. Mark that it is one and the same Person Who had glory with the Father before all worlds, and now prays that it may be restored to Him; but though the Personality is one, He is now in a different condition, for He has inseparably united to Himself our human nature, and He asks that He may receive again His pristine glory in this nature. There is no place which more strikingly sets forth the truth of the words of the Creed, "The Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost is all one, the glory equal, the majesty co-eternal." The One Person, Jesus Christ, Who "being in the form of God, thought it not a thing to be tenaciously held to be equal with God," now asks that that may be restored to Him which, for our sakes, He had laid aside. What was it? It was such a form of God as necessarily implied equality with God (Phil. ii. 6). Let it be remembered also that this petition was not solely on behalf of

6 [l]I have manifested thy name unto the men [m]which thou gavest me out of the world: thine

[l] ver. 26. Ps. xxii. 22.
[m] ver. 2, 9, 11. ch. vi. 37, 39. & x. 29. & xv. 19.

Himself: for if every tongue confesses that Jesus Christ is Lord, it is "to the glory of God the Father." It was also for His people, for God hath answered the prayer, and put all things under His feet, that "He might be Head over all things to the Church, which is His Body" (Ephes. i. 22, 23).

6. "I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me." What Name did the Saviour manifest? It can be no other than the Name of "The Father." It could not have been any of the Names of God revealed in the Old Testament, such as Jehovah, Elohim, Most High, for Moses and the Prophets had abundantly manifested these names. But it is very remarkable that the most endearing Name of God,—the Name of the Father, is scarcely known in the Old Testament. He is but once or twice called a Father, as in Deut. xxxii. 6, Isaiah lxiii. 16, and in no place as essentially a Father. Never once is He designated as the Father. And indeed it cannot have been otherwise, for the Revelation of God as a Father depends upon the fact that He is a real Father, and this Fatherhood consists not in His having created men, or angels, of some substance which He has made, which must be a substance and a nature other than His own, much less in adopting a Son out of another family, but in giving existence out of His own substance to One Who is of the same nature as Himself, and so of the same power and the same character.

This, the Revelation of the Father as eternally and essentially a Father, in the nature of things could only be through the manifestation of a true and real Son, and so it was reserved to the Incarnation and Manifestation amongst us of the true and only Son, by union with Whom men could be as they had never been before, sons of God.

But how has Christ manifested the Father's Name? Not merely by asserting His Father's Paternity and His own Sonship, but by visibly manifesting the character, the power, the grace, the love, the wisdom, indeed all that constitutes the spiritual nature of the Father, so perfectly that He could say, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."

"The men which thou gavest me out of the world. Thine they were," &c. There is peculiar emphasis laid upon this, that the

they were, and thou gavest them me; and they have kept thy word.

7 Now they have known that all things whatsoever thou hast given me are of thee.

8 For I have given unto them the words [n] which thou gavest me; and they have received *them*, [o] and

[n] ch. viii. 28. & xii. 49. & xiv. 10.
[o] ver. 25. ch xvi. 27, 30.

Apostles, and in them other believers, were given by the Father to Christ that they should be peculiarly His own, not as excluding them from the domain and ownership of the Father, but as bringing them nearer to the Father as parts, or members, of Himself, the Son. Thus the Lord says, "I am in My Father, and ye in Me, and I in you," and His servant says, "The head of every man is Christ . . . and the head of Christ is God," and again, "Ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's" (1 Corinth. xi. 3, and iii. 23).

"Thine they were." They were the true children of God, as sincere and religious members of the Jewish Theocracy. This is particularly shown by the leaders of them having been disciples of such an one as the Baptist, and in all probability, more of them had been followers of John than those especially mentioned as such. If we had made known to us the secret religious history of each one of them before they began to follow Jesus, we should see with what wisdom God had chosen them, and how He had drawn and disciplined, kept and taught them, till He gave them to His Son. Men freely criticize their ignorance, and their narrow and partial views, and their seemingly deep-rooted Judaism, and yet God must have discerned some special fitness in each one of them (even in the traitor before he fell) that they should be given to His Son as His companions and the carriers on of His work.

7. "Now they have known that all things whatsoever thou hast given," &c. They have known that of Thee is all my teaching, of Thee are the deep mysteries of the New Birth, and of the eating of My Flesh, of Thee are all things that I have taught them of the Good Shepherd, and of the Water of Life. Of Thee are all things that I have taught them of Thyself and of the Spirit. Of Thee are all the mighty works that I have done.

8. "For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me, and," &c. Notice here how the knowledge of the Apostles

have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me.

9 I pray for them: [p] I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me; for they are thine.

[p] 1 John v. 19

10 And all mine are thine, and [q] thine are mine; and I am glorified in them.

[q] ch. xvi. 15.

---

which saved them and enabled them to be Apostles, depended upon their obedience. "They have kept Thy word, for what I said to them is not Mine, but Thine; they have received the words which Thou gavest me, no matter how deep and mysterious, no matter what they set forth respecting Myself and Thee, and so they have known surely that I came out from Thee, and they have believed that Thou didst send Me."

9. "I pray for them: I pray not for the world." This has been explained as if it means, "I pray not for the unbelieving world, for those who, because of sin, cannot believe;" but surely He is the Saviour of the world, and even the world will have, sooner or later, some part in His Intercession. Does it not rather mean, "I pray not *now* for the world. I pray at the present time for these only on whom Thou hast made its conversion to depend. These thou hast given to Me out of the world, apart from it, that they may be thoroughly sanctified and separated from it ere they can, in My Name, act upon it for good." Then He proceeds to say, "For they are thine." In praying for them, I pray for Thine own—those in whom Thou hast as much part as I have, though Thou hast given them to Me.

10. "And all mine are thine, and thine are mine, and I am glorified in them," &c. The Father did not, because He gave them to the Son, Himself lose those whom He gave: seeing the Son still goes on to say, "And all mine are thine, and thine are mine." Whence it sufficiently appears, how all things that are the Father's are the only-begotten Son's; namely, because He also is God, and begotten of the Father, and equal to the Father. These words, in the mouth of any mere creature, would be blasphemy. But He Who said it had made all things, and "without him was not anything made that was made," so that in all created things He had the most perfect of all rights, that of the Creator.

11 [r]And now I am no more in the world, but these are
[r] ch. xiii. 1. & xvi. 28.
in the world, and I come to thee. Holy Father,
[s] 1 Pet. i. 5. Jude 1.
[s]keep through thine own name those whom thou

---

11. "Through thine own name those (οὓς) whom thou hast given." "Through thine own name which [ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ᾧ] thou hast given." So ℵ, A., B., C., L., most later Uncials, Syriac, and some versions; so D. which reads ᾧ; but old Latin, Vulg., and some versions read as in Rec. Text.

11. "And now I am no more in the world, but these are in the world," &c. These verses recognize the human solicitude exercised by the Son of God over His own. He had kept them hitherto by His presence, His watchfulness, His needful encouragements and reproofs. All this was His human action as their loving Master, and with His departure they must of necessity lose it, and the loss of such oversight would be perilous. It was absolutely necessary, if they were to be preserved to the Church to carry on the work of Christ, that they should be kept in the Faith or Name which Christ had received from God and given to them, and in which at present they were standing. They must also be kept together in unity, and in love to one another. This He had hitherto done personally, as for instance, when they had disputed which should be the greatest He had washed their feet. But now this tender, loving, personal watchfulness exercised by the Man Christ Jesus was to cease. They were to be left to themselves whilst Christ returned to His Father. So the Lord commits them into the hands of His Father, just as a dying parent would commit his little ones to God. This was no mere form. God works on human beings by such human means as the unceasing watchfulness of parents, or ministers, or teachers. This is as necessary in its place as the Divine Superintending Providence is in its place. And at a time of extreme danger they were to be cast upon themselves: "Satan desiring to have them, that he might sift them as wheat." And so the Lord, Who had hitherto kept them in a state of holy separation from the world, now commits them to His Father, using the (with Him) unique expression "Holy Father;" thus reminding God of His own infinite holiness as a plea that He should keep them in the holiness to which, through Christ's never-ceasing watchfulness, they had attained.

"Keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given," &c. A very great preponderance of authorities read, "Keep them through the Name which (Name) Thou hast given to Me." The

hast given me, [t] that they may be one, [u] as we *are*.
12 While I was with them in the world, [x] I kept them in thy name: those that thou gavest me I have kept, and [y] none of them is lost, [z] but

[t] ver. 21, &c.
[u] ch. x. 30.
[x] ch. vi. 39. & x. 28. Heb. ii. 13.
[y] ch. xviii. 9. 1 John ii. 19.
[z] ch. vi. 70. & xiii. 18.

---

12. "In the world" omitted by ℵ, B., C., D., L., old Latin (b, c, e, f, g), Vulg.; retained by A., later Uncials, Cursives, and Syriacs.

"I kept them in thy name: those that thou gavest me." "I have kept them in thy name which (name) thou hast given, and guarded them." So B., C., L., some versions: but A., D., later Uncials, most Cursives, Vulg., and Peshito as in Rec. Text.

'Name" of God, which Christ received from God to make known unto men, was "the Father." "Keep them through thine own Name" means, "Keep them in the realizing belief of Thy Fatherhood, that Thou art the Father of Me, and then of themselves in Me."

"That they may be one, as we are." As I said before, there seems to have been some deep, mysterious necessity that the Apostles should keep together as one—as much as possible even in the same place (John xx. 24; Acts i. 13, 14), that there should be no divisions among them, no jealousies, no separations. Apparently it was in the counsels of God that the Holy Spirit should descend upon the Apostolic body in full number (Acts i. 21-26), and in perfect unity in itself. We, in the present divided state of the Church, cannot recognize the necessity for this. But that it was, in the sight of God, a necessity, is certain. "That they may be one, as we are." No unity can be more perfect than that between the persons in the Godhead, and yet such an Unity is prayed for by Christ on behalf of the Apostolic band. As the Fatherhood in the Godhead is the type of all Fatherhood, as the love between the Persons in the Godhead is the original, uncreated love from which all created love is derived, so the unity of mind and will between the Persons of the Godhead is the pattern of all unity of purpose and will in all intelligences.

12. "Whilst I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name," &c. The Lord here reminds His Father how unceasingly and perfectly He had fulfilled His will in keeping and guarding the disciples He had given to Him, so that the Father, Who had given them to Him, should make good the personal absence of the Son.

"And none of them is lost, but the son of perdition; that the scrip-

[a] Ps. cix. 8. Acts i. 20.

the son of perdition; [a] that the scripture might be fulfilled.

13 And now come I to thee; and these things I speak in the world, that they might have my joy fulfilled in themselves.

[b] ver. 8.
[c] ch. xv. 18, 19. 1 John iii. 13.
[d] ch. viii. 23. ver. 16.

14 [b] I have given them thy word; [c] and the world hath hated them, because they are not of the world, [d] even as I am not of the world.

ture might be fulfilled." As if He said, "It is true that one is lost, but Thine own word predicts the fall. So that, having regard to the conditions under which Thou hast decreed that souls should be kept in a state of grace, to keep him was impossible."

Judas was lost by his own free-will determinedly choosing evil in the presence, and under the teaching, and in spite of the warnings, of Jesus Christ. God Who, dwelling in eternity, foresees all possible contingencies, foresaw his fall, and foretold it, and made it to serve His purposes of grace in redemption, without having, in the least degree, fore-ordained it. It is to be remembered that the fall of Judas, terrible though it was, is only one instance out of multitudes in which God permits men to receive gifts which they fling away, and occupy spheres for which in the end they, through their own fault, prove themselves unfit.

13. "And now come I to thee; and these things I speak in the world . . . . my joy," &c. I leave the world and come to Thee, but, before I leave the world, I say these things to Thee in their hearing, that they may see how We love them, and that they may persevere, and so at last enter into My joy (see particularly for a parallel instance, xi. 42).

Or Christ's joy may here mean that deep, calm, unutterable sense of joy at the thought of His Father's love, and so the knowledge which the disciples received respecting it by hearing His communing with the Father would make them even now enter into it, seeing that He assured them that, by being one with Him, they were sharers in His Father's love.

14. "I have given them thy word; and the world hath hated them." "This word being the message of deliverance from sin and from this evil world has already raised them above the world and translated them into My kingdom, and so the world hath hated

15 I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but [e] that thou shouldest keep them from the evil.

16 [f] They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world.

[e] Matt. vi. 13. Gal. i. 4. 2 Thess. iii. 3. 1 John v. 18.
[f] ver. 14.

---

15. "The evil." Perhaps, "from the evil one."

them." This must have been said from His perfect knowledge of the hearts of all men, for, as yet, all the enmity of the Jewish world had been concentrated on Himself. He alone, in Jerusalem at least, had spoken in the ears of the world, and had drawn upon Himself its wrath, but He saw plainly that those who had so openly cast in their lot with Him, were already partakers of it, for the Jews had long before this decreed, "that, if any man confessed that He was the Christ he should be put out of the synagogue" (ix. 22).

15. "I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but," &c. He had spoken of being "no more in the world," of being "not of the world," and that "they were not of the world as He was not." It might follow from this that they who heard His prayer would expect to be removed out of the world, so as to act upon it, as He would, from some higher sphere, but this was not His or His Father's will: His chosen ones had a lifelong conflict to maintain after His departure, and so He prays not that they should be removed out of the sphere of evil, but that they should be kept from the evil; either the evil which is in the world, or its prince, the evil one, who directs its energies against the truth. Notice how the Lord here prays that those who had already received His words, and had been separated from the world by their faithful reception of them, should be kept from its evil influence. Can anything more clearly show that as long as men are here their probation is not finished: they have yet to maintain a warfare, and have ever need of the Intercession of Christ, lest they should be entangled and overcome?

"They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world." Remember how the Apostle says, "As he is, so are we in this world." As He had received the word of the Father and kept it, so had the Apostles, through Him, received the same word, and, because of this, had partaken of His separation from the world.

17 [g] Sanctify them through thy truth: [h] thy word is truth.

18 [i] As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world.

g ch. xv. 3. Acts xv. 9. Eph. v. 26. 1 Pet. i. 22.
h 2 Sam. vii. 28. Ps. cxix. 142, 151. ch. viii. 40.
i ch. xx. 21.

17. "Thy truth." "The truth" read in ℵ, A., B., C., D., L., old Latin, and Vulg.; but later Uncials, Cursives, Syriac, and some versions read as in Rec. Text.

"Sanctify them through (or in) thy (or the) truth: thy word is truth." To sanctify is not so much to purify from sin as to hallow, or dedicate, or consecrate to the service of God. "The holy is not opposed to the impure, but merely to the natural. To sanctify is to consecrate to a religious use anything pertaining to common life. Thus in Exodus xxix. 1 (Septuagint) where the priests are said, 'to be hallowed to minister, in the priest's office,' the word translated 'hallow' is the same as this, which is here rendered 'sanctify.' From an Old Testament point of view consecration was an external and ritual act; under the New Covenant, where all is spiritual, the seat of consecration is first of all the heart, or will of the person consecrated. In saying, then, 'sanctify them,' Jesus solicits for them a heart entirely devoted to the task they will have to fulfil in the world. Their whole strength, talents, life, must be dedicated to this great work, the salvation of men, which involves the renunciation of all self-gratification, however lawful, the absence of all interested aims and all self-seeking." (Godet.)

"Thy word is truth." The "Word" here has been taken to mean the personal Word, in Whom is the whole enunciation and revelation of the truth of God, but the Lord never speaks of Himself as the Word, so we should rather take it to mean that which He had just said that He had given to them, *i.e.*, the revelation of the Father, and of Himself as the Son and very Image of the Father. This, as it had already raised them above the world, so if, by God's help, they abode in it, would do so increasingly. This truth or Word of God sanctified them for the work of the Apostleship by raising them above the falsehood and littleness, as well as the wickedness of the world.

18. "As thou hast sent me into the world, so have I sent them into the world." This is a further reason why God the Father should keep them from the evil and sanctify them. As the Son

19 And [k] for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be ‖ sanctified through the truth.

20 Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word;

[k] 1 Cor. i. 2. 30. 1 Thess. iv. 7. Heb. x. 10.

‖ Or, *truly sanctified.*

---

19. "Through the truth." Literally, "in truth."

20. "Shall believe." "Believe" in the present tense is read by an overwhelming majority of authorities, ℵ, A., B., C., D., L., most later Uncials and Cursives, Syriac, and versions. Only some old Latin and Vulg. as in Rec. Text.

Himself had been sanctified (*i.e.*, consecrated) by the Father to represent Him and redeem the world, so had the Son sent His Apostles into the world to represent Him, and apply the Redemption which He wrought.

19. "And for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified," &c. The Lord here means, "For their sakes I consecrate Myself as a holy and spotless Victim by the suffering I now submit to undergo, that they also may be sanctified"—that is, that they may receive the fulness of the Spirit, Who will guide them into all the truth, and by that guiding fit them to represent Me, and carry on My work. If we take it as sanctified "in truth" it is the same, for he who is sanctified by the truth is sanctified in truth and reality. Is, then, the consecration of Christ only for the Apostles? No, but it was especially for them, to this end, that through them the means of universal sanctification was established in the preaching of the Gospel and in the foundation of the Church. It was the will of God that the Church should be in them, inasmuch as they were the first branches into which the True Vine divided itself.

20. "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also," &c. This expression, "for these alone, but for them also," is to be remarked. The Church was in the Apostles, its doctrine, fellowship, sacraments were ordained by God so to depend upon their sanctification or consecration, that, in praying for the Apostles, the Lord prayed for the fulfilment of God's purposes in the Church which sprung from them; and yet, as the Apostles existed not for themselves but for the whole Church, the Lord mentions "all those which believe on Him through their word." Not which *shall* believe, but which, according to the best reading, believe *now*; the belief of believers in distant ages being anticipated in the faith of the first Christians,

21 [l]That they all may be one; as [m]thou, Father, *art* in me, and I in thee, that they also

[l] ver. 11, 22, 23. ch. x. 16. Rom. xii. 5. Gal. iii. 28.
[m] ch. x. 38. & xiv. 11.

---

who believed through the word of the Apostles themselves. Believers in all ages are thus combined in a single body. "This saying of Jesus assigned a capital part in the life of the Church to the Apostolic *word*. Jesus did not recognize in the future any faith capable of uniting man to God, and of preparing Him for glory, except that which should be begotten and nourished by the teaching of these eleven Apostles." (Godet.) The teaching of St. Paul, it may be added, was in no respect different, but entirely founded upon the original tradition; so, at least, he most emphatically asserts in 1 Corinth. xv. 1, &c.

21. "That they all may be one." Is it possible that so immense a body of persons should be one? It is not impossible, for here the Lord prays for it: so that we may be sure that no divisions of the Church are of necessity, all come from the perverseness of man, and are contrary to the will of God and the prayer of Christ.

"As thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be [one] in us." The unity of the members of the Church is not a unity of mere opinion, or of purpose, or of mutual agreement, but it is a unity with one another, because they are in God and in Christ. It is a unity, the increase and perfection of which depend upon many things. It depends, for instance, upon holiness, for wilful sin cuts off from Christ, and therefore from oneness with Him and God. It depends upon our abiding in the faith or word which was "once for all delivered unto the saints," or St. John would not have been inspired to write, "Let that therefore abide in you which ye have heard from the beginning. If that which ye have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, ye also shall continue in the Son and in the Father" (1 John ii. 24). St. Paul calls men to it by the consideration of certain great unifying truths, "There is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all" (Ephes. iv. 4, 5, 6). It depends, one may say, almost necessarily on the realization of the grace of sacraments. That by baptism we are grafted into one Body and by the Eucharist are partakers of One Bread, and so are

may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.

22 And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; [n] that they may be one, even as we are one:

[n] ch. xv. 20. 1 John i. 3. & iii. 24.

21. "One in us." "One" omitted by B., C., D., some old Latin (a, b, c, e): retained by ℵ, A., C^3., L., later Uncials, nearly all Cursives, some old Latin (f, g, q), Vulg., Coptic, Syriac, &c.

continued in One Body. This unity was realized for a short period in the Pentecostal Church, for they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine, and in their fellowship, and in the breaking of bread, and in the prayers, "and the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul" (Acts ii. 42, iv. 32).

"That the world may believe that thou hast sent me." It is to be remarked that this wonderful prayer is not for the holiness of the Church, or its zeal, or its activity, but for its oneness; for the Lord here prays for the conversion of the world, but the conversion of the world as, in the counsels of God, depending upon the unity of those who present Christ's message to the world. The holiness and goodness of Christians, if they have not unity, is distracting to the outside world. The world asks, "If such holy men differ, what are we to believe?" They have asked, and are unceasingly asking this in such immense fields of labour as India and China, and can they do otherwise? It stands to reason that the sight of one Holy Catholic Church, immense in numbers, purifying itself from sin, rich in good works of faith and charity, and withal presenting one undivided front, would be overwhelming. Men may call this a dream, but it is a dream for the realization of which Christ here prays.

22. "And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them." This glory is most probably the glory of being sons of God by the indwelling and leading of the Spirit: for the especial grace of Christ to those who receive Him is described in the exordium as, "power to become the sons of God." And by St. Paul in the words, "God sent his Son, made of a woman, made under the law . . . that we might receive the adoption of sons" (Gal. iv. 4, 5). This view agrees best with the contents of verses 22 and 23. Christ's true Sonship involves His Unity with the

23 I in them, and thou in me, [o] that they may be made
[o] Col. iii. 14. perfect in one; and that the world may know
that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast
loved me.

[p] ch. xii. 26. & xiv. 3. 1 Thess. iv. 17. 24 [p] Father, I will that they also, whom thou
hast given me, be with me where I am; that they
may behold my glory, which thou hast given me
[q] ver. 5. [q] for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the
world.

---

23. "And" omitted by B., C., D., L., some Cursives (33, 69, 124), some old Latin (a, e, g), Coptic; retained by A., later Uncials, almost all Cursives, and Syriacs.

24. "I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me," &c. "That (*ho* (neuter) which thou hast given Me, they also may be with Me." So ℵ, B., D., Coptic but A., C., L., later Uncials, all Cursives, old Latin, Vulg., Syriac, Sah. Arm. and Ethi as in Rec. Text.

Father, the sonship of His followers involves their spiritual unity with Him and with His Father.

23. "I in them, and thou in me . . . loved them, as thou hast loved me." Here the Lord, as it were, advances in His demand that His Church may be perfect in one, that the world may not only *believe*, but *know* that God has sent Him.

"And hast loved them, as thou hast loved me." What is the proof to the world that the Father has loved the Son? Evidently that the Son so fully partakes of the goodness and wisdom and love and holiness of God. Such gifts can only come from the Author and Giver of all goodness, and so the more the character of Christ is reproduced in His followers the more certain will the world be that they are true sons of God by belonging to Christ and so partaking of the filial gifts which are characteristic of God's Son.

24. "Father, I will that they also, whom thou." Notice the word "I will"—not "I pray," but it is My wish, simply expressing the desire. This accords with what we said before, that this chapter is an act of converse as much as a prayer. How very human this request is! These men had been witnesses of His humiliation: He naturally desires that they should behold His Glory, the Glory which He shared with the Father, as He had shared His love, before the foundation of the world. As they had seen the humiliation of the

25 O righteous Father, [r] the world hath not known thee: but [s] I have known thee, and [t] these have known that thou hast sent me.

26 [u] And I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare *it:* that the love [x] wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them.

[r] ch. xv. 21. & xvi. 3.
[s] ch. vii. 29. & viii. 55. & x. 15.
[t] ver. 8. ch. xvi. 27.
[u] ver. 6. ch. xv. 15.
[x] ch. xv. 9.

---

26. "Declared." "I have made known unto them" (Alford and Revisers); *notum feci eis* (Vulg.).

Divine Son in His human nature, and acknowledged it, and believed, notwithstanding His lowliness, that He came from God, so He wills that as the reward of this they should see His Divine Glory shining through the same human nature. It was only right that He and they should be thus rewarded, and so He says,

"O righteous Father," O Father, Who givest to all what is right and just, "the world hath not known thee," and so Thou mightest justly leave them in their ignorance, but I Whom Thou sentest into the world under the same conditions of human nature as My brethren, "I have known thee," and these have progressed in Thy knowledge which I have given them, so far as they were able, even so as to have known that Thou hast sent Me.

26. "And I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it," &c. I have declared unto them Thy Name of Father throughout all My past intercourse with them.

"And will declare it" still more fully at Pentecost, and will continue to make it known to them, that "the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them." This is the counterpart of what He had said before, "If a man love me, he will keep my sayings, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." God loves the true believer as being not in Himself but in Christ, and because Christ is in him: and so the final mystery of God's love to believers is, that God loves them as one with His Son.

CHAP. XVIII.

WHEN Jesus had spoken these words, [a] he went forth

[a] Matt. xxvi. 36. Mark xiv. 32. Luke xxii. 39.

We now come to the testimony of the beloved disciple to the Lord's condemnation and Sacrificial Death. The differences between his account and that of the Synoptics are very considerable and yet not only is his narrative capable of being reconciled in almost every point with that of the first three Evangelists, but is their necessary supplement, rendering much in the older narratives intelligible, as we shall notice as we proceed.

St. John recounts very briefly the events from the departure to Gethsemane to the delivery of the Lord to Pilate, and seems to hasten to the examination before Pilate, in his account of which he reports certain matters which are in remarkable accordance with the characteristic features of this Gospel—in fact, are what is called Johannine, and yet are absolutely necessary to the right understanding of much in the Synoptic accounts.

1. "When Jesus had spoken these words, he went forth with . . and his disciples." It is impossible to say, with anything like certainty, where the words of the Lord, as contained in the 15th 16th, and 17th chapters, were spoken. At the end of the discourse in the 14th chapter the Lord had said, "Arise, let us go hence.' They must then have left the room where He had instituted the Eucharist, and where He had washed their feet. The part of the discourse which follows could not, we should think, have been delivered as they walked through the public roads to the place where they crossed the brook. The words seem too solemn, and to demand too much attention, to have been uttered as they passed through places of public resort. It is conjectured that the prayer in chap. xvii., being an act of priestly intercession, would most fittingly have been said in the Temple, which, it is also conjectured, lay in their way. But the Evangelic writers are not careful to inform us respecting thousands of such matters of time and place

with his disciples over [b] the brook Cedron, where was a garden, into the which he entered, and his disciples.

[b] 2 Sam. xv. 23.

2 And Judas also, which betrayed him, knew the place: [c] for Jesus ofttimes resorted thither with his disciples.

[c] Luke xxi. 37. & xxii. 39.

---

1. "The brook Cedron." The Received Text, with the great majority of MSS. (B., C., E., G., H., K., L., &c.), read the word as if it meant "the brook of the Cedars." Some MS. (א, D., and some old Latin), as if it were "the brook of the Cedar," supposing that the name of the brook was derived from the name of the tree. It, however, signifies "black." The pronunciation according to the Hebrew pointing is Kidrŏn.

They rather seem as if they were led by a higher Power to discourage the investigation of such things.

But a question of far more importance which should be answered is this: immediately after He had uttered the prayer the Lord went over the brook to endure the agony; how could the depth of peace and serenity of this act of converse with His Father be exchanged, in so short a time, for the fearful bitterness and distress of the scene in Gethsemane? There is no difficulty about it, if He so assumed our whole nature with all its sinless weaknesses, as to be able to enter into our fluctuations of soul, our rapid alternations between mental joy and anguish, hope and fear. And besides this He had, but a few hours before, experienced a foretaste of what He was about to endure, when He exclaimed, "Now is my soul troubled. What shall I say? Father, save me from this hour." If this trouble of soul passed into the calmness of the subsequent discourse and the prayer, this latter might also give way in its turn to the agony in Gethsemane.

"Over the brook Cedron." The Lord passing the Kedron cannot fail to remind us of his ancestor and type passing over the same brook (2 Sam. xv. 23), only with this difference, that David passed over it to flee from treachery and violence, whereas Christ passed over that He might endure these evil things for our sakes.

2. "And Judas also, which betrayed him, knew the place: for Jesus," &c. He must have watched to see whether, after his departure, the holy company went over the Kedron, and, if they did, he knew whither they would resort, and there would be his opportunity to betray the Lord "in the absence of the multitude." (Luke xxii. 6.) "The remembrance of the prayers in which our

3 [d] Judas then, having received a band *of men* and officers from the chief priests and Pharisees, cometh thither with lanterns and torches and weapons.

[d] Matt. xxvi. 47. Mark xiv. 43. Luke xxii. 47. Acts i. 16.

4 Jesus therefore, knowing all things that should come upon him, went forth, and said unto them, Whom seek ye?

5 They answered him, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus saith

5. "Jesus of Nazareth;" rather, "Jesus the Nazarene," said in contempt. In John i. 45, it is "Jesus out of Nazareth."

Lord had so often passed whole nights in this place, and of which the traitor had been himself a witness, was not capable of softening his heart." (Quesnel.)

3. "Judas then, having received a band *of men* and officers," &c. Literally, "having received the band (of soldiers) and (also) officers from," &c. "The band was a part of the cohort, or part of the Roman legion, stationed in Jerusalem, which occupied the citadel Antonia, at the north-western angle of the Temple." It is not here used technically to signify the whole number belonging to a maniple. The word officer is not to be understood in the higher sense in which we most frequently use the word, but simply as men employed on such duties,—in fact, "police." Thus, in chap. vii. 32, the chief priests "sent officers to take him."

"With lanterns and torches." As it was full moon, these were probably brought with the view of discovering Him if He took refuge in the dark ravine of the Kedron, or in the olive-groves. The mention of these lights is peculiar to St. John, and is a proof that the writer was an eye-witness.

4. "Jesus therefore, knowing all things that should come upon him." With the full consciousness of all that He should suffer, and in order that the whole counsel of God might be fulfilled.

"Went forth," either from the garden, at the entrance of which He was awaiting their arrival, or from before the company of the disciples who were around Him.

"Whom seek ye?" In the moment before this we are to place the sign given by the traitor. Jesus did not, however, wait for them to take advantage of it. It was, after all, a superfluous act of wickedness, for the Lord stepped forward to the front to proclaim Himself.

5. "They answered him, Jesus of Nazareth." No doubt they

ito them, I am *he*. And Judas also, which betrayed him, ood with them.

6 As soon then as he had said unto them, I am *he*, they ent backward, and fell to the ground.

---

d heard of the multitudes crying, "This is Jesus, the prophet of azareth of Galilee."

"Jesus saith unto them, I am he" (or "I am").

"And Judas also, which betrayed him, stood with them." aving committed the act of treachery, he had fallen back into e front of those whom he was leading.

6. "As soon then as he had said unto them, I am he, they went ckward," &c. It has been much discussed whether it was an ercise of supernatural power by which those sent to take him fell ostrate. Commentators who willingly acknowledge His Godhead em to hesitate; it being an almost universally received axiom at even in the life of the God-Man we are, if possible, to avoid a iracle. It has consequently been ascribed to the majesty of our rd's appearance, or to His supreme virtue contrasted with the nse of guilt in those who came to take Him. But will this bear vestigation for a moment? If the extraordinary majesty of His uman Person, or His goodness and holiness, produced the effect prostrating those sent to take Him (though they were only obey- g the orders of their superiors), why was it not uniform in its tion? It had not hitherto protected Him; on the contrary, many nes before He had to escape out of their hands. On one occasion e officers had refused to apprehend Him, but it was because of e power of His words, not because of the majesty of His appear- ce. If He could assume this appearance of superhuman dignity, d lay it aside at pleasure, then it was as much a supernatural dowment as any other power which He possessed, as, for in- nce, the light which He caused to stream from His Person at is Transfiguration.

Two reasons, at least, can be alleged for this exhibition of power. took place that He might show that He surrendered Himself to ath willingly. Not only was it impossible to take His Life from im, but even to seize His Person till He willed that men might do . It took place also that He might send His disciples away in fety. It convinced those who came to apprehend Him, that even

7 Then asked he them again, Whom seek ye? And they said, Jesus of Nazareth.

8 Jesus answered, I have told you that I am *he*: if therefore ye seek me, let these go their way:

9 That the saying might be fulfilled, which he spake, "Of them which thou gavest me have I lost none.

[e] ch. xvii. 12.

10 [f] Then Simon Peter having a sword drew it, and smote the high priest's servant, and cut off his right ear. The servant's name was Malchus.

[f] Matt xxvi. 51. Mark xiv. 47. Luke xxii. 49, 50.

---

in the extremity of weakness and submission, in which He suffered Himself to be bound, He had power to protect His own. If they had not thus felt His power, the whole company of the disciples would have been apprehended.

Some commentators suppose that it was the power of the word "I am" (not "I am he"), which being the Name of God was "with power," but this seems inconsistent with what follows, when He says, "I have told you that I am he," *i.e.* Jesus of Nazareth, the Man whose name they had pronounced. Still we are bound to acknowledge that, inasmuch as the Lord partook of the self-existent Nature, the words "I am" on His lips are suggestive of infinitely more than they could be on the lips of any other human being (see particularly chap. viii. 24, and 58).

7, 8, 9. "Then asked he them again . . . let these go their way . . . have I lost none." The words of the Lord here referred to, at the time He said them to the Father (ch. xvii. 12), evidently contemplate the eternal life of the Apostles, in the preservation of their faith. "While I was with them in the world I kept them in thy name . . . and none of them is lost," &c., but here the Evangelist seems to interpret them as referring to the temporal deliverance of the Apostles from sharing in the sufferings of the Lord. But the reconciliation is clear. If the Apostles had been then made partakers of the Lord's Sufferings they would not have been able to endure it, they would have made entire shipwreck of their faith, and so the temporal deliverance was in their case needful to the spiritual one.

How perfect a forecast is this of the great act of Redemption; the Lord taken, His people going free because He was taken!

10, 11. "Then Simon Peter having a sword [Luke xxii. 38] . . .

11 Then said Jesus unto Peter, Put up thy sword into the sheath; [g] the cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?

[g] Matt. xx. 22. & xxvi. 39, 42.

12 Then the band and the captain and officers of the Jews took Jesus, and bound him,

---

the cup which my Father," &c. This incident is recorded in each of the four Evangelists, but the differences are noteworthy. The Synoptics mention neither the name of him who inflicted the blow nor of him who received it. St. Mark mentions the mere fact, and nothing more. St. Matthew tells us how it called forth from the Lord the words, "All they that take the sword, shall perish with the sword. Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?" St. Luke, that the Lord healed the servant of the high priest. St. John, besides mentioning that it was Peter who struck the blow, gives us also the name of the servant. This is in remarkable accordance with what is said afterwards, that he (John) was known unto the high priest. If so he would probably know personally some at least in his household, and he not only names the sufferer as Malchus, but also mentions that he had a kinsman attached to the high priest, who said to Peter, "Did I not see thee in the garden with him?" All these are undesigned coincidences worthy of devout regard.

"The cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?" The Lord had just endured the agony in which He had prayed so earnestly that the cup should pass from Him; now He speaks as having accepted the cup, and being prepared to drink it in all its bitterness. St John makes no allusion to the agony, but he mentions the cup respecting which the Lord had prayed, "Not my will, but thine be done."

12. "Then the band and the captain [chiliarch] and the officers," &c. The circumstance that all these—band, captain, officers—took part in binding the Lord, seems to express their fear, having had such proof of His power in healing Malchus, and in prostrating the foremost of them. As He willingly delivered Himself, they saw that He was sincere in submitting to be taken, but they nevertheless acted as those who had to perform a dangerous duty.

"And led him away to Annas first; for he was father-in-law," &c.

[h] See Matt. xxvi. 57.
[i] Luke iii. 2.

13 And [h] led him away to [i] Annas first; for he

It will be necessary to consider, for commentators are much divided upon it, where this first examination of Jesus took place, and by whom, whether in the house of Annas or of Caiaphas? and whether Annas or Caiaphas put the questions? At first sight it appears to have been at the house of Annas, and, if so, the high priest [Luke iii. 2, and Acts iv. 6] who questioned the Lord, would probably have been Annas. In support of this it is alleged, and with truth, that in the accounts in the Synoptics there is no mention of any examination by Caiaphas of Jesus Himself, but only of witnesses brought against Him. But in answer to this it is asserted that St. John never recognizes Annas as the high priest, and lays particular stress upon the fact that Caiaphas held the office, and that, in virtue of his holding it, he spake on a certain occasion not of himself, but from God, unconsciously prophesying respecting the Death of the Lord for all men, which prophecy is now again referred to as a sort of identification of the man.

If we are to give its due weight to this, the high priest who questioned the Lord respecting "His disciples and His Doctrine," must have been Caiaphas, and it has been supposed that he was informally present at the hearing before Annas, and put the questions.

But the circumstance which must rule the matter from first to last is evidently this, that the whole examination of the Lord, whether before Annas or Caiaphas, or both, must have taken place in the same building in which Peter denied Him. All the four narratives require that all the denials by Peter should take place at the door of, or by the fire of, one hall. The circumstance then of the first denial, as related by St. John in verses 15-19, undoubtedly took place at the palace of Caiaphas, for it is impossible to suppose that the lighted fire at which they warmed themselves, of verse 25, which was certainly in the hall of Caiaphas, was a different one from that of verse 18, which, if all that took place before the "sending bound" of verse 24 took place at the house of Annas, must have been at the house of Annas. The examination, then, recorded in verses 12-21, and the indignity of verses 22-23, which the Lord endured, must have taken place at the palace of Caiaphas. It has been, however, supposed that Annas lived in the palace of Caiaphas, but on such an hypothesis it seems difficult to account

was father in law to Caiaphas, which was the high priest that same year.‖

‖ *And Annas sent Christ bound unto Caiaphas the high priest.* ver. 24.

---

for the special mention of the "taking to Annas first," and it seems equally difficult to believe that the sending of the Lord bound on the part of Annas was but sending Him from one room to another of the same house.

The key of the whole matter is, I believe, in the fact that Jesus was first sent to Annas, *because* he was father-in-law to Caiaphas. Why should special mention be made of this relationship? Evidently because, according to all the Theocratic laws and traditions, Annas was by far the most important person—in fact, the fountain of all high priestly authority at that time, for, according to Josephus, he had had five sons who held the priesthood, and Caiaphas, who was only his son-in-law, was then acting high priest, of course solely through his influence.

According to strict Levitical precedent he must have been the real high priest, for the mere son-in-law of the high priest could not be high priest except by some arrangement not contemplated by the original law of the priesthood. The sons of the high priest might be coadjutors in the lifetime of their father, but no son-in-law could be actual high priest except by the interference of some foreign authority. The Lord then was taken before Annas merely to have his sanction for the arrest and subsequent trial; nothing was done by Annas, or at his house or apartments, except to remit Him to Caiaphas. No other reason that I can see can be given for this hearing by "Annas first," *because* he was father-in-law to Caiaphas, except this; but it is a very sufficient reason, for it was of the utmost importance that the condemnation of One Who assumed to be the Messiah, should not only be by the authority of the acting high priest, which was in fact Roman, but by the sanction of him in whom alone the Aaronic succession, so far as it then existed, resided.

If it be the fact, that the whole examination was before Caiaphas, then the statement made in verse 24 (like very many other statements in the Gospels) is not in exact chronological order, but must be read between verses 14 and 15. Supposing, however, that this first examination took place before Annas, then the account of St. Peter's first denial is not in its place, but must be

14 [k] Now Caiaphas was he, which gave counsel to the
[k] ch. xi. 50. Jews, that it was expedient that one man should die for the people.

[l] Matt. xxvi. 58. Mark xiv. 54. Luke xxii. 54.

15 ¶ [l] And Simon Peter followed Jesus, and *so did* another disciple: that disciple was known

---

understood as occurring immediately after what is recorded in verse 24.

We now resume at verse 14.

14. "Now Caiaphas was he, which gave counsel to the Jews, that it was expedient," &c. Why is this man's name thus connected with his prophecy? Evidently to show that Jesus would find no justice or mercy at his hands. In unscrupulously using every means to procure the Lord's condemnation, he would think that he was serving his country.

15. "And Simon Peter followed Jesus, and so did another disciple," &c. Respecting the lessons to be learnt from St. Peter's fall, and the independent form in which it is presented to us by each of the four Evangelists, see notes on St. Matthew xxvi. We shall have to notice that the account of St. Peter's denials in this Gospel is more merciful to him than those of the Synoptics.

Thus, at the commencement, the Synoptical accounts unite in saying that "he followed afar off;" St. John, on the contrary, simply saying that Simon Peter "followed Jesus." Was it right in him to do this? Judged by all our feelings of loyalty and generous disregard of dangers on behalf of a friend, it could not but be right; but we are to remember that the Lord was to be honoured by implicit obedience to every intimation of His will, and He had not only warned St. Peter repeatedly of his weakness, but had expressly said to him, "Whither I go thou canst not follow me now, but thou shalt follow me afterwards."

"And so did another disciple"—no doubt St. John himself, or he would have given the name of "the other." He is careful to give the names of the least-known apostles, as Nathaniel, Philip, Thomas, Jude; but he never mentions his own name.

"That disciple was known unto the high priest." It is impossible to conjecture the reason for this. Some suppose that it had been brought about by his occupation as a fisherman; others, that as there was a tradition respecting him that he wore the "petalon,"

unto the high priest, and went in with Jesus into the palace of the high priest.

16 [m] But Peter stood at the door without. Then went out that other disciple, which was known unto the high priest, and spake unto her that kept the door, and brought in Peter.

[m] Matt. xxvi. 69. Mark xiv. 66. Luke xxii. 54.

17 Then saith the damsel that kept the door unto Peter,

---

he must have been of a priestly family (see quotation from Polycrates, in Eusebius iii. 31, v. 24).

"And went in with Jesus into the palace of the high priest," *i.e.*, into the palace of Caiaphas. If, as seems most likely from verse 24, the house of Annas was some distance from the palace of Caiaphas, then the stay at the house of Annas must have been very brief—in fact, as I have noticed, only sufficient to allow of Annas formally remitting Him for trial to Caiaphas.

"Palace," rather court. It was the space (either open or covered with an awning) in which public business was transacted, around which were the private apartments, and communicated with the street by the one gate or door by which access was had to the whole interior.

16. "But Peter stood at the door without." Evidently not from cowardice, but because he was not known to anyone within the palace; and the high priest would take care that as few as possible of the friends of Jesus should enter.

"Then went out that other disciple . . . . brought in Peter." Evidently at his own desire. The delay might have given him time to recollect the Lord's earnest warnings. The fact that he was admitted through the influence of John is naturally mentioned by this Evangelist alone; probably he was the only one who knew of it.

17. "Then saith the damsel that kept the door unto Peter, Art thou also?" &c. It is very remarkable that the "also" (*καὶ*) is reported by each Evangelist, though in St. John's narrative only has it any meaning. For the damsel knew that St. John was a disciple, and asks Peter whether *he* was not one *also*. So that, in all four Gospels, the exact words are faithfully recorded, though in this Gospel only have we the presence of St. John recognized, which gives a suitable sense to the "also."

Art not thou also *one* of this man's disciples? He saith, I am not.

18 And the servants and officers stood there, who had made a fire of coals; for it was cold: and they warmed themselves: and Peter stood with them, and warmed himself.

The damsel is said by St. John to have opened the door, and brought in Peter, and then to have addressed the question to him, "Art thou not also one of his disciples?" This implies that she knew Peter as having been with the Lord; but, inasmuch as it was dark, how did she recognize his features? for St. John had evidently not told her who he was whom he desired to bring in. She could only recognize him by the light of the fire which had been kindled; for we read in St. Luke, "A certain maid beheld him, as he sat by the fire, and earnestly looked upon him." So that, in St. John's account, the 18th verse is the explanation of the thing related in the 17th, that the damsel recognized him by the light of the fire—not at first, when she opened the door, but as the glow from the fire lighted up his features.

It is not only probable, but natural, that the maid should say all the three things which are attributed to her by SS. Matthew, Luke, and John. She would ask as recorded in St. John, "Art not thou also one of this man's disciples?" She would, as giving a reason, add to this what is reported in St. Matthew: "Thou also wast with Jesus of Galilee;" and she would (as in St. Luke) appeal to the bystanders: "This man also was with him." And it is also not only possible, but extremely probable, that each Evangelist gives some of the very words said by Peter, "I am not," "I know him not" (Luke, John); "I know not, neither understand I what thou sayest" (Matt., Mark). It is exceedingly improbable that either the maid, in accusing the Apostle, or St. Peter in denying her accusation, confined themselves to a single utterance.

There seems to have been no excuse, so to speak, for the first denial. The maid must have known that St. John was a disciple, and yet he was without danger in the hall. St. Peter must have known this, so that he might have relied on the Lord's words, "Let these go their way," as a protection from all risk on the score of discipleship.

19 ¶ The high priest then asked Jesus of his disciples, and of his doctrine.

20 Jesus answered him, "I spake openly to the world; I ever taught in the synagogue, and in the temple, whither the Jews always resort; and in secret have I said nothing.

[a] Matt. xxvi. 55. Luke iv. 15. ch. vi. 14, 26, 28, & viii. 2.

21 Why askest thou me? ask them which heard me, what I have said unto them: behold, they know what I said.

20. "The Jews always resort." "Where all the Jews resort," so in ℵ, A., B., C., L., most old Latin, Vulg., Syriac, and most versions; but D., some later Uncials, and most Cursives read as in Received Text.

19. "The high priest then asked Jesus of his disciples, and of his doctrine." No doubt as to their numbers, their influence, and the compact by which they were held together. This question respecting His disciples could not have been the first subject of inquiry, unless the Lord had very manifestly associated the Apostles with Himself, and made them His representatives, and worked through them.

20. "Jesus answered him, I spake openly to the world . . . in secret have I said nothing." The Synoptical narratives show us how constantly the Lord taught in the synagogues, and this Gospel is a witness how publicly He taught in Jerusalem in the Temple.

"In secret have I said nothing." This, of course, is not to be taken as contradicting such a statement as "when they were alone, he expounded all things to his disciples" (Mark iv. 34), but as meaning that He had no doctrine which, for any purpose, He desired to conceal. Thus publicly in the Temple, at the risk of being stoned, His discourse touched upon the Divine relationship between Himself and the Supreme God. His deepest discourse which occasioned most offence (John vi.) was delivered in a synagogue: and publicly in Jerusalem, in the face of His enemies, He spake of Himself as the co-equal Son, as the Supreme Judge in the place of the Father, as by His word bringing about the resurrection of the dead, as the Light of the world, as existing before Abraham.

21. "Why askest thou me? ask them which heard me," &c. The Lord knew how the chief priests and rulers, and those sent by them, were continually on the watch for words that they might bring against Him, so that He is only appealing to themselves when

22 And when he had thus spoken, one of the officers which stood by [o] struck Jesus || with the palm of his hand, saying, Answerest thou the high priest so?

[o] Jer. xx. 2. Acts xxiii. 2. || Or, *with a rod.*

23 Jesus answered him, If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil: but if well, why smitest thou me?

He meets their questions with, "Ask them which heard me. They know what I said."

22. "And when he had thus spoken, one of the officers . . . the high priest so?" The word translated, "struck with the palm of his hand," may signify struck him with a rod, which we know the servants had in their hands. The words used in the Lord's answer, "Why smitest," literally, "Why flayest thou me?" would seem to signify a blow which would break the skin. The Syriac, however, renders it by a blow on the cheek. The fact that such a wanton insult should have been inflicted on a prisoner in the presence of the high priest without rebuke or punishment on him who perpetrated the outrage, shows the mockery of justice throughout the trial.

23. "Jesus answered him, If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil," &c. The answer of the Lord has reference, most probably, to the form or nature of the examination. He had been questioned respecting His "doctrine," and He appealed to the publicity of His teaching, "Ask them which heard me." It is then as if He said, "If on any occasion I have spoken false doctrine or blasphemy, come forward and say what you have heard, but do not wantonly insult Me." St. Augustine notices how the Lord here carries out in spirit His own precept, "Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." "Here," he writes, "some may say: Why did He not do what Himself hath enjoined? For instead of thus answering the smiter, He should have turned to him the other cheek. Yea, but did He not both answer truly, gently, and righteously, and not merely turn the other cheek to the smiter for a second blow, but yield His own body in a readiness to be fixed on the tree! And thereby He rather showed what needed to be shown, namely, that those, His own great precepts of patience are to be put in practice, not by outward show of the body, but by preparedness of heart. For visibly to present the other cheek is no

24 [p] Now Annas had sent him bound unto Caiaphas the high priest.

25 And Simon Peter stood and warmed himself. [q] They said therefore unto him, Art not thou also *one* of his disciples? He denied *it*, and said, I am not.

p Matt. xxvi. 57.

q Matt. xxvi. 69, 71. Mark xiv. 69. Luke xxii. 58.

---

24. "Now Annas had sent him bound." The literal translation is, "Annas then sent him bound." A., later Uncials, most Cursives read simply, "Annas sent him bound;" ℵ, Vulg., and Syriac read, "but Annas," &c.; B., C., L., a few Cursives, old Latin (a, b, f, ff), as in Received Text.

more than even an angry man can do. How much better, then, that He both with mild answer speaks the truth, and with tranquil mind is prepared to endure even worse outrages!"

24. "Now Annas [had] sent him bound unto Caiaphas the high priest." For the time when this took place, see on verses 13, 14.

25. "And Simon Peter stood and warmed himself. They said therefore," &c. The account of this second denial differs from the report in the Synoptics only in circumstances in which any independent witness giving his own account of such a matter would differ from another equally independent witness relating the same story.

St. Matthew tells us that another maid brought forward the charge (Matt. xxvi. 71). St. Luke says, "another saw him," using, however, the masculine gender (Luke xxii. 58). St. John uses the general term "they," "They said therefore unto him." St. John's account, "They said," &c., is perfectly at one with the rest, if we consider that if one began such an accusation, others standing around, who had been at the Lord's capture, would take it up, or if the accusation began to be murmured by several at once, it would be brought home to the man accused by one person, in this case another maid.

There is, however, an apparent difficulty respecting the place of the second denial. St. Matthew says (xxvi. 57) it was "in the porch." St. Mark in the forecourt (xiv. 68). St. John seems to assert that it was by the fire where Peter was warming himself. The reconciliation seems natural and easy. The accusation, perhaps, on the part of several ["They said therefore unto him"] began as he was warming himself. He retired, as was very likely, from the crowd by the fire, which would not be far from the porch,

26 One of the servants of the high priest, being *his* kinsman whose ear Peter cut off, saith, Did not I see thee in the garden with him?

---

to the forecourt or porch, perhaps a yard or two, and then he was attacked by the maid, and denied the second time. The conduct of the maid was exactly the same as before. She accused Peter, "Art not thou also one of his disciples?" [or as in St. Luke, "Thou art also one of them"], and she addressed the bystanders, "This man also was with Jesus of Nazareth," "This is one of them." The answer of Peter also is the same: "I am not," "I know not the man."

26. "One of the servants of the high priest, being his kinsman," &c. In the case of this third denial, "They that stood by" [Matth., Mark] began the accusation. "Surely thou art one of them, for thou art a Galilean" (and thy speech agreeth thereto, or "bewrayeth thee"). And then one addressed his comrades, "Of a truth this fellow also was with Him, for he is a Galilean." And another who was a kinsman of the man wounded by Peter clenched the matter, "Did not I see thee in the garden with Him?" Of the denial on St. Peter's part no words are given by St. John; simply, "Peter then denied again."

Such is the threefold fall of the foremost Apostle. On account of the accusations of adversaries to the faith, we are obliged to examine the account as if it were on its trial, before we draw from it warning and consolation; warning in that an Apostle when he boasted and trusted in himself, fell grievously, so that there is no hope except in looking up from moment to moment to the Lord for the grace He promised when He said, My "strength is made perfect in weakness."

And yet consolation. Indeed we may humbly venture to think that this melancholy failure in one so eminent and favoured, was permitted to occur to afford us encouragement and hope in similar situations and temptations, and that as our Lord could not afford us an instance of human infirmity in Himself, He has given it to us in the person of the most exalted of His pastors; that all may fear and none may presume, and all may hope. "On this account," says St. Leo, "as it appears, he was allowed to waver, that the remedy of repentance might be laid up in a chief of the Church, that no one should dare to trust in his own goodness, since even the blessed

27 Peter then denied again: and [r] immediately the cock crew.

28 ¶ [s] Then led they Jesus from Caiaphas unto [‖] the hall of judgment: and it was early; [t] and they themselves went not into the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled; but that they might eat the passover.

[r] Matt. xxvi. 74. Mark xiv. 72. Luke xxii. 60. ch. xiii. 38.

[s] Matt. xxvii. 2. Mark xv. 1. Luke xxiii. 1. Acts iii. 13.

[‖] Or, *Pilate's house*, Matt. xxvii. 27.

[t] Acts x. 28. & xi. 3.

Peter could not escape the danger of mutability." . . . "We may indeed consider it as one of those emanations of exceeding compassion which stream from the cross of Christ, like the acceptance of the penitent thief, and our Lord's prayer for His murderers. They are like objects of mercy kneeling around the cross, from whose reception every sincere penitent may find consolation to the end of time." (Isaac Williams.)

27. "Peter then denied again: and immediately the cock crew." Upon, and after this we are to read the words in St. Luke, "And the Lord turned and looked upon Peter. And Peter remembered the word of the Lord, how he had said unto him, 'Before the cock crow thou shalt deny me thrice.' And Peter went out and wept bitterly."

28. "Then led they Jesus from Caiaphas." Before this we must insert the remainder of the examination before Caiaphas, in which the false witnesses were examined and the Lord, when adjured by the high priest to say whether He was the Son of the Blessed, and the Son of God, answered, "I am, and ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power" (Mark xiv. 62). And also the more formal meeting before the council as recorded in St. Luke.

"And they themselves went not into the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled," defiled, *i.e.*, by entering into a dwelling which had not been prepared for holding the feast in it, by the search for and removal of every particle of leaven. They scrupled about entering lest there may have been some crumb of leavened bread in some hole or corner, and they themselves were full of the leaven of malice and wickedness.

It is evident from their conduct and from the express declaration of the Evangelist in the next chapter (verse 14) that that day (Thursday evening to Friday evening) was, in the estimation of St.

29 Pilate then went out unto them, and said, What accusation bring ye against this man?

30 They answered and said unto him, If he were not a malefactor, we would not have delivered him up unto thee.

John, not the day of the eating of the Paschal Lamb, but the day of killing it; so that, according to him, our Lord must have been crucified at the time of the slaying of the lamb, and so He must have kept His Passover meal a day before the time at which the chief priests eat theirs. I have shown in my note on St. Matthew that it is absurd to suppose that this circumstance would invalidate His Passover while so many of the features of the original Passover had been abolished by human authority. Our Lord was crucified on the Friday, but whether this or the day before was the day of the killing of the lamb has been a matter of dispute from, at least, the second century, and is not likely to be settled now. It is most probable that each person to whom the matter is a subject of interest will form his opinion from this, whether he considers that it is more important that the Lord should have celebrated the Passover at the legal time, or whether He should, as the true Paschal Lamb, have died at the time when the Passover Lamb was killed. St John, who unquestionably intimates that He died on the day of the slaying of the lamb, is the only Evangelist who cites the command in Exodus xii. 46, that not a bone of the paschal lamb was to be broken, as having been fulfilled in what happened to His Blessed Body before He was taken down.

29. "Pilate then went out unto them, and said, What accusation bring ye?" &c. Pilate having, as we suppose, himself granted the use of the Roman soldiery to apprehend Jesus, could only have known that He had committed something criminal in the eyes of the chief priests, but of the specific charge he had not been informed. So now he formally demands it.

30. "They answered and said unto him, If he were not a malefactor," &c. How is it that they avoided bringing before Pilate the charge of blasphemy on which they had condemned Him in their own council? Evidently because Pilate would not have listened to any such matters. So they simply state that He was a malefactor, and endeavour to force Pilate to condemn Him on their mere word that He was such.

31 Then said Pilate unto them, Take ye him, and judge him according to your law. The Jews therefore said unto him, It is not lawful for us to put any man to death:

32 [u] That the saying of Jesus might be fulfilled, which he spake, signifying what death he should die.

[u] Matt. xx. 19. ch. xii. 32, 33.

33 [x] Then Pilate entered into the judgment hall again, and called Jesus, and said unto him, Art thou the King of the Jews?

[x] Matt. xxvii. 11.

34 Jesus answered him, Sayest thou this thing of thyself, or did others tell it thee of me?

---

31. "Then said Pilate unto them, Take ye him, and judge him according to," &c. Pilate refused to act as their executioner, and bid them condemn and execute Him themselves.

This brings out their murderous intention—that nothing but death would satisfy them, and death they had no power to inflict.

32. "That the saying of Jesus might be fulfilled . . . what death he should die." In declining all power to punish Him, they unconsciously fulfilled His own prophecy—that He must die by being lifted up or crucified. If they had inflicted death upon Him, that death must have been stoning.

33. "Then Pilate entered into the judgment hall again . . . . King of the Jews?" What suggested to Pilate this question? St. Luke tells us. The Jews had accused Him to Pilate in the words: "We found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, saying that he himself is Christ a King" (xxiii. 2). Very probably Jesus was left in the hall whilst Pilate went out to the chief priests; and when they found they must make some definite charge, they accused him in the words recorded by St Luke.

34. "Jesus answered him, Sayest thou this thing of thyself? or." The Lord could not answer Pilate's question directly, for His answer must depend upon the sense in which Pilate used the word "King." If Pilate spake of himself—*i.e.*, as a Roman whose duty was to uphold the imperial power—he must mean by a king an earthly sovereign, whose pretensions, especially amongst so fanatical a people, must be dangerous to the Roman dominion. In this

35 Pilate answered, Am I a Jew? Thine own nation an
the chief priests have delivered thee unto me: what ha
thou done?

36 [y] Jesus answered, [z] My kingdom is not
this world: if my kingdom were of this worl

[y] 1 Tim. vi. 13.
[z] Dan. ii. 44. & vii. 14. Luke xii. 14. ch. vi. 15. & viii. 15.

---

sense Christ was not a king; but if Pilate had taken the word fro
the accusation of the Jews, "Christ a King," then the Lord cou
not deny it without denying His claims to be the Messiah. T
Lord's question to Pilate was put with infinite wisdom. It elicit
the very answer which the Lord required to enable Him to show
Pilate the true nature of His kingdom.

35. "Pilate answered, Am I a Jew? Thine own nation and t
chief priests?" &c. "Am I a Jew, to understand your superstitio
and your hopes of Him Whom you call the Christ? Your ow
nation, ever a disaffected people, and the chief priests of your re
gion, who ought to understand your prophesies and your nation
hopes, have delivered Thee unto me." Jesus, upon this, now answ
in words which at once showed to Pilate the spiritual nature
His kingdom, and convinced him that the Lord was as far
possible from being a King who would be dangerous to Cæsar.

36. "Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if m
kingdom were of this world," &c. My kingdom is not of this wor
This saying of the Lord, though it contains a general truth of t
widest application, must be primarily understood as referring
Pilate's questioning. Neither the origin, the principles, the w
fare and extension, nor the bond of union of Christ's kingdom
of this world. Its origin is His own Person. He came down fr
heaven. He came into the world, not after the manner of hum
generation, for He was conceived by the Holy Ghost. He took
is true, a thing of this world when He assumed our nature; but
assumed it to deliver it from, and raise it above, this world. Neit
are the principles of this kingdom those of any earthly kingdo
for the principle of any earthly kingdom is worldly policy, mate
prosperity, social progress; whereas the principle of Christ's ki
dom is receiving the truth, holding fast to the truth, progressing
the Divine Life by obeying the truth. Neither is the warfare
extension of this kingdom "of this world." Like many evil agg
sive kingdoms of this world it extends itself by conquest; and

hen would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered
o the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence.

37 Pilate therefore said unto him, Art thou a king then?
Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end

---

s in a state of prosperity, it is in a state of warfare; but "the weapons
f its warfare are not carnal." It fights, it extends itself by preach-
ng the truth, by teaching that truth to all ages, and sorts, and
onditions of men; but its weapons of warfare are not merely
eaching and preaching, it extends itself by meekness, forbearance,
ong-suffering, and forgiveness of wrong—men seeing these things
n its ministers are subdued to it. And its bonds of union are not
f this world. Its bonds of union are joint holding of the truth in
he creeds, and partaking of two rites, by one of which a man is
rafted into the Body of One at the right hand of God; by the
ther, he is continued in the unity of the Same Body.

Such is the kingdom not of this world. When the Lord says
'My kingdom is not of this world," He says all this, and much
nore; and if Pilate had but received Him, and submitted to Him,
n less than two months he would have understood all these things
especting His kingdom.

"If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants
ight," &c. If Jesus had set up a standard for men to rally round,
s the princes of this world do, His servants (not merely His disci-
les, but the vast multitudes who so lately cried, "Blessed be the
King of Israel, who cometh in the name of the Lord") would not
ave tamely submitted to see Him thus bound a prisoner.

"Now is my kingdom not from hence." This "now" does not
mply that the Lord's kingdom will ever be "of this world," or
'from hence;" but it does imply that the time will come when its
resence and power will be overwhelming.

37. "Pilate therefore said unto him, Art thou a king then?" No
doubt this is the same interrogation as in the Synoptics. "Art thou
a king then,"—"Art thou the King of the Jews?" And the Lord's
answer is the same, Thou sayest—thou sayest that I am a king.
But now the Lord goes on to show the instrument by which He
ruled. He ruled by bearing witness to the truth. By this witness
He called forth all who belonged to God, and separated them to
be His subjects, according as He had said before: "He that is of
God heareth God's words."

was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that [a] is of the truth heareth my voice.

[a] ch. viii. 47. 1 John iii. 19. & iv. 6.

38 Pilate saith unto him, What is truth? And

"To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world," &c.—that is as if He said, "At the will of My Father I became incarnate, and was born into the world, not to exercise an earthly sovereignty, but to witness to God My Father, and to make known His Name, and His will, and His love; and by this exhibition of the truth of God, to bow the hearts of men to Myself." Such seems to be the meaning of the Lord's words. Thus Godet: "It is quite evident that Jesus wishes to explain by them in what sense He is King. He conquers the world by testimony borne to the truth, and His people are recruited from all men who have the sense of truth. It is by His prophetic work that Jesus founds His kingdom among men. The truth, the revelation of God—this is the sceptre which He passes over the earth. The mode of conquest which Jesus here unveils to Pilate was the opposite of that whereby the Roman power was founded."

There is, however, a very different meaning attached to these words, which, though I do not think it is the true one, has still much truth in it. "The Lord sets forth here, in the depth of these words, the very idea of all kinghood. The King is the representative of the truth; the truth of dealing between man and man; the truth of that power which, in its inmost truth, belongs to the great and only Potentate, the King of kings." (Alford.)

38. "Pilate saith unto him, What is truth?" Very different views have been held respecting the spirit in which Pilate asked this question. Some hold that it is "the profession of a frivolous scepticism, such as is frequently met with in the man of the world," and on his lips means, that there is no such thing as truth. Others have looked upon it as a cry of despair—meaning, "who will show it to us; where is it to be found?" Many of the ancients, on the contrary, think that Pilate asked the question in all sincerity. Thus Chrysostom supposes that, by what the Lord had been saying, He attracted and persuaded Pilate to listen to His discourse; and, therefore, at last led him on to ask the question, "What is truth?" And, in answer to the objection that Pilate did not stay to receive

when he had said this, he went out again unto the Jews, and saith unto them, [b] I find in him no fault *at all*.

39 [c] But ye have a custom, that I should release unto you one at the passover: will ye therefore that I release unto you the King of the Jews?

[b] Matt. xxvii. 24. Luke xxiii. 4. ch. xix. 4, 6.
[c] Matt. xxvii. 15. Mark xv. 6. Luke xxiii. 17.

---

the Lord's answer, Chrysostom remarks: "For the present he applieth himself to what was pressing, for he knew that this question needed time, and desired to rescue the Lord from the violence of the Jews." The subsequent conduct of Pilate, however, is in no respect that of a man who was sincerely inquiring after truth.

"And when he had said this, he went out again . . . no fault at all." What the Lord had said respecting the nature of His kingdom had convinced Pilate that the Roman government had nothing to fear from such a King; and so he went forth to the Jews with the words: "I find in him no fault at all." Upon this there follows the accusations of "many things" in St. Matthew and St. Mark (Matt. xxvii. 12, 13; Mark xv. 3-8), and the "sending to Herod" of St. Luke.

The first part of the examination before Pilate is needful to explain the fact (related in Luke xxiii. 1-4) that, after the Lord had been accused of making Himself a King, and after Pilate had asked Him the truth of this, and had received the affirmative answer, "Thou sayest it," he at once turned to the chief priests and people, and said, "I find no fault in this man." Surely, as the governor of a people at once so excitable and so disaffected, he was bound to examine the nature of the pretension. The Synoptics give no such examination. This St. John supplies, and his account is thus a needful supplement to the Synoptical narrative.

39. "But ye have a custom, that I should release unto you . . . King of the Jews." Here is the first indication of the miserable weakness of Pilate. He found no fault in the Man, and yet he feared the chief priests and people, for he knew that they had ample grounds for accusing him before Cæsar for maladministration; and so he would not incur the odium of at once releasing, on his own responsibility, the Man Whom he had pronounced innocent. He endeavours to shift the burden of the Lord's release upon the people, just as he did that of His condemnation upon the chief priests.

40 [d] Then cried they all again, saying, Not this man, but Barabbas. [e] Now Barabbas was a robber.

[d] Acts iii. 14.
[e] Luke xxiii. 19.

"The King of the Jews." It is to be remarked how Pilate, from first to last, persists in calling Jesus the "King of the Jews." It is as if, like Caiphas, he "spake not of himself." When he spake in scorn and contempt he was directed by a higher Power to "prophecy" the truth.

40. "Then cried they all again, saying, "Not this man," &c. The rejection of Jesus for a robber and murderer is, like all else in this terrible narrative, typical. It is in our power, after our way, to betray Him, to deny Him, to reject Him, even to crucify Him afresh. Putting aside altogether the Lord's Godhead, which, of course, they who rejected Him for Barabbas were unconscious of, they must have been aware that they were rejecting a teacher of righteousness, a healer of the sick, a restorer of sight, and some of them must have heard that He had even raised the dead, and this Man they rejected, clamorously rejected, for a robber and murderer. They knew not what they did, and yet we are sure that they never would have been permitted to do what they did unless each one of that profane and lawless multitude had long before, of set purpose, chosen evil rather than good. We cannot but suppose that each one of them must have been for years hardening himself, or he would never have been on that most sacred Passover morning one of a mob clamouring for blood. "There is, in everything, a better and worse, a good and an evil to us. If we choose good we choose God, Who alone is good, and is in all things good; if we choose evil we do, in fact, choose the evil one. There are degrees of choice as there were degrees and steps in the rejection of the Lord. Yet each led on to the next. Each hardens for the next. 'No one ever became at once wholly vile,' is even a heathen proverb. But there is no safety against making the very worst choice, except in the fixed, conscious purpose, in all things to make the best." (Dr. Pusey, from a sermon entitled "Barabbas or Jesus?")

CHAP. XIX.

THEN [a] Pilate therefore took Jesus, and scourged *him*.
2 And the soldiers platted a crown of thorns, and put *it* on his head, and they put on him a purple robe,

[a] Matt. xx. 19. & xxvii. 26. Mark xv. 15. Luke xviii. 33.

---

1. "Then Pilate therefore took Jesus, and scourged him." This scourging was so fearful a punishment that it could not have been inflicted on the Lord more than once, or, humanly speaking, He would have sunk under it. We are to understand then that this was the scourging usually inflicted on those who were about to be crucified, and it was inflicted now at this time by Pilate in the hope that this torture would have been sufficient to satisfy their cruelty. Pilate inferred this when he said, "I will, therefore, chastise him and release him" (Luke xxiii. 16). "Scourging, as practised among the Romans, was so cruel a punishment that the prisoner very often succumbed to it. The scourge was formed of switches, or thongs, armed at the extremity with pieces of bone, or lead. The prisoner received the strokes while fastened to a small post, so as to have his back bent, and the skin on the stretch. The back became quick flesh, and the blood spurted out with the first strokes." Thus "he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and by his stripes we are healed."

2. "And the soldiers platted a crown of thorns, . . . Hail, King of the Jews." See notes on St. Matthew's Gospel. In all probability the mocking of our Lord by these Roman soldiers, which seems to have been voluntary on their part and not directed by Pilate, though connived at, and afterwards, as we shall see, made use of by him, was rather directed against the Jews than against our Lord, of Whom they knew nothing. They took up Pilate's words that He was, "the king of the Jews," and acted on them as they would have done against any other of the hated race who might have been given up to their brutality.

3 And said, Hail, King of the Jews! and they smote him with their hands.

4 Pilate therefore went forth again, and saith unto them,

---

3. ℵ, B., L., some later Uncials, a few Cursives, most old Latin, Vulg., and many versions read, "And they came to him and said" (Alford, "They kept coming to him"); A., D. (a later hand), some later Uncials, most Cursives, and Syriac as in Received Text.

4. "Pilate therefore." ℵ, with some Cursives, old Latin (a, c. e, f, g, q), Vu g. (Cod. Amiat.), and some versions read without any copula; E., G., H., M., and most Cursives read as in Authorized, "Pilate therefore;" A., B., K., L., and Syriac read, "And Pilate went forth."

"And they smote him with their hands." St. Matthew and St. Mark recount other indignities—they put a reed in His right hand, they spit upon Him, and took the reed and smote Him on the head (Matt. xxvii. 27, 30), and bowing their knees worshipped Him (Mark xv. 19).

What shall we say to all this which the Lord endured? Let us hear what an eloquent saint said: "But do thou, O man, when thou hearest these things, and seest thy Lord bound and led about, deem present things to be nought. For how can it be otherwise than strange, if Christ bore such things for thy sake, and thou often canst not endure even words? He is spit upon, and dost thou deck thyself with garments and rings, and if thou gain not good report from all, think life unbearable? He is insulted, beareth mockings, and scornful blows upon the cheek; and dost thou wish everywhere to be honoured, and bearest thou not the reproachings of Christ? . . . When, therefore, anyone makes a jest of thee, remember thy Lord, that in mockery they bowed the knee before Him, and worried Him, both by words and deeds, and treated Him with much irony. But He not only did not defend Himself, but even repaid them with the contraries—with mildness and gentleness." (Chrysostom.) Does anyone think that the saint here is unreal, or exaggerated, or bids sinful men imitate what is impossible to be followed? Hear an Apostle who goes much further, when he says that we are actually *called* to follow the Lord in this very matter. "Even hereunto were ye called, because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example that ye should follow his steps . . . Who when he was reviled, reviled not again, when he suffered he threatened not." (1 Pet. ii. 23.)

4. "Pilate therefore went forth again . . . I find no fault in him." Let it be noticed how frequently Pilate reiterates this. Surely he

Behold, I bring him forth to you, [b] that ye may know that I find no fault in him.

[b] ch. xviii. 38. ver. 6.

5 Then came Jesus forth, wearing the crown of thorns, and the purple robe. And *Pilate* saith unto them, Behold the man!

6 [c] When the chief priests therefore and officers saw him, they cried out, saying, Crucify *him*, crucify *him*.

[c] Acts iii. 13.

---

speaks not of himself when he thus repeatedly pronounces Jesus to be the Just One!

5. "Then came Jesus forth . . . Behold the man!" These words seem, on Pilate's part, to have been an appeal to their pity. They seem to say, "What hatred or envy can ye bear against so meek and gentle a sufferer?" "If upon the king ye look with an evil eye, now spare because ye see Him cast down. He is scourged, crowned with thorns, clad with a garment of mockery, scoffed at with bitter taunts, smitten with the palms of men's hands, His disgrace overflows, let your hate subside." (Augustine.)

But surely these are not the words of man. Out of himself Pilate spake not thus. For this is God's great, God's saving command, with the eye of faith to behold Jesus. See how God in His Word calls upon us to behold Him: "Behold, and see, if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow." "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world." "Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth. I have put my spirit upon him: He shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles." "Behold the man whose name is the Branch." "Looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith." It is impossible to regard such words said of the world's Redeemer on the very day of Redemption, by the judge who condemned Him to the redeeming Death, as if they began and ended in themselves. For He was the Man compared with Whom there seems to be no other. He was the one Man Who could gather unto Himself, and be surety, and sponsor, and make atonement for, and mediate on behalf of, all His brethren. The words have an universal, an eternal significance.

6. "When the chief priests therefore and officers . . . Crucify him, crucify him." These chief priests must have been some of the heads of the courses, holding such a place in the Temple, and per-

Pilate saith unto them, Take ye him, and crucify *him*: for I find no fault in him.

d Lev. xxiv. 16.
e Matt. xxvi. 65. ch. v. 18, & x. 33.

7 The Jews answered him, [d] We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because [e] he made himself the Son of God.

8 ¶ When Pilate therefore heard that saying, he was the more afraid;

---

7. "And by our law." So A., most later Uncials, all Cursives, and most versions; but ℵ, B., D. (later hand), L., most old Latin, and Vulg. read, "by the law."

forming the same holy functions as did Zachariah, the father of the Baptist. Wickedness and cruelty could not go beyond this—that men, taking at that very time the leading part in the holiest feast of God's religion, should, with their creatures (the officers), hound on such a crowd to demand not the death only, but the death by extreme torture, of the innocent and helpless Man before them. It is to be remembered, however, that they were Sadducees, and their leaders intruded into the holy office by Roman influence.

"Take ye him, and crucify him, for I find no fault in him." It is impossible to say whether this was said in impatient anger and scorn, knowing that they had no power to inflict death, or whether Pilate here gave them permission to take the law into their own hands. If they had acted on his word, they could have shifted the responsibility on him. But it is very probable that they knew that it would require the Roman power to administer such a punishment. As the day advanced, the feelings of the multitude might have changed, and another crowd might have rescued the Prisoner.

7. "The Jews answered him, We have a law, and by our law he ought," &c. There is no such law in the book of the law, expressed in any such words. But they understood the unity of the Divine Nature in such a sense as that no other Person, Son or Spirit, could be in that Unity, or partake of It. They understood the Unity of God in the sense in which Mahometans or Socinians now do; and so for anyone so to put himself by God's side, as to say that he worked with God, or would judge men as if he were God, or to say that God was his own proper Father, as Jesus had done, was, in their eyes, blasphemy, and the blasphemer was to be put to death.

8, 9. "When Pilate therefore heard that saying, . . . whence art thou?" The whole bearing of the Lord, the words which He had

9 And went again into the judgment hall, and saith unto Jesus, Whence art thou? [f] But Jesus gave him no answer.

[f] Is. liii. 7. Matt. xxvii. 12, 14.

10 Then saith Pilate unto him, Speakest thou not unto me? knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and have power to release thee?

---

uttered respecting His kingdom not being of this world, so different from any which Pilate had been accustomed to hear; perhaps, also, the report of His miracles, which Pilate could not be altogether indifferent to, had impressed him with an undefined feeling of awe. It may be, too, that at this time he had received the message of his wife. All these things increased a fear which had already disturbed him, and made him still more anxious to dismiss Jesus. He, consequently, went into the judgment hall again, into which the Jews would not enter, in order that he might put to Him more privately the question, "Whence art thou?"

No question such as this has been preserved to us in the Synoptics. It is altogether Johannine, corresponding to such declarations as, "I came forth from the Father and am come unto the world," "I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will," "The Father which sent me." And yet, putting all the circumstances together, it was exceedingly probable that Pilate should have put some question to Jesus respecting His origin. In fact it could scarcely have been otherwise if he had heard of the circumstances of the Lord's condemnation before the Sanhedrim.

"But Jesus gave him no answer." Why did not the Lord answer him? It has been supposed that Pilate had not asked sincerely; but have we any right to say this? On the contrary, he put the question out of real awe, for he was "the more afraid." Must not the reason have been that, in his then state of knowledge, the Lord could not have told him whence He was? How could He have told such a man that "He came down from heaven," that the one true God, of Whom Pilate knew nothing, was His Father, and yet so one was He with God that He did nothing apart from Him?

10. "Then saith Pilate unto Him, Speakest thou not unto me . . . . to release thee?" As all the Lord said, or refused to say, was ordered by Him Who had "given Him a commandment what He should do and what He should speak," we may assume that

11 Jesus answered, [g]Thou couldest have no power *at all* against me, except it were given thee from above:

[g] Luke xxii. 53. ch. vii. 30.

11. "Thou couldest have." So B., most later Uncials, almost all Cursives, Vulg. (*haberes*); but ℵ, A., D. (later hand), L., some later Uncials and a few Cursives read "thou hast."

the silence of the Lord was intended to bring out this assertion of authority and power on the part of Pilate. He has been blamed for such a declaration of power, but in an unbelieving Gentile it was only natural. He believed that he had this unlimited authority over our Lord, as he supposed he had over every other person in his jurisdiction, for undoubtedly he represented the supreme worldly dominion.

11. "Jesus answered, Thou couldest have no power at all against me . . . . greater sin." To enter into the force of this answer of the Lord's we must remember that the wilful and determined wickedness of man, and that alone, brought about the crucifixion of Christ; for the circumstances of His Death were so ordered by God that it could only be consequent upon certain acts of extreme wickedness on the part of the race He came to redeem. He could not be put to death as, humanly speaking, any other man could, at any time, in any place, under any circumstances. He could not be taken at any time. His hour came at a certain Passover season only; He could not be taken in any place, for He was to suffer without the gate at Jerusalem—which two things signify that His Death must be the consequence of crimes perpetrated by voluntary agents at the holiest season, and in the holiest city. But especially was it in the counsels of God that His Death should follow upon two acts of deliberate wickedness, such as perhaps no human beings had ever before committed. He must be twice delivered up. "The Son of Man shall be *delivered* unto the chief priests, and unto the scribes, and they shall condemn Him to death, and *deliver* Him to the Gentiles" (Mark x. 33). Here are two acts of betrayal preceding the Death of Christ, and the first, that on the part of Judas to the chief priests and scribes, by far the most wicked, because it was the betrayal, *i.e.* the delivering up, on the part of one who knew far more perfectly the spotless innocence and extreme goodness of his Master, and who had for two years or more seen all His works and heard all his words. Next to this in wicked-

therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin.

12 And from thenceforth Pilate sought to release him: but the Jews cried out, saying, [h] If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend: [i] whosoever maketh himself a king speaketh against Cæsar.

[h] Luke xxiii. 2

[i] Acts xvii. 7.

---

ness was the "delivering up" on the part of the chief priests, because they were the heads of the Theocracy and the guardians of the Law. If they had been innocent in their lives and sincere in their religion, God would have led them, before all other men, at once to recognize the Messiah in the Lord. The words of the Lord then signify something of this sort: "Thou thinkest that thou hast the same power over Me as over any criminal whose evil doings have brought him before thy tribunal. Thou hast no such authority over Me. Thou couldst have no power against Me, unless I had been betrayed to thee by those who know My innocence, and who obstinately and wilfully reject the evidence of My claims to be the Christ. Thou art only the blind, but guilty instrument in carrying out the greater wickedness of those who know the truth respecting Me, and have wilfully rejected it. This is ordered from above, for My Death will not be a common death. It will not be the result of any power which thou wieldest, but of the greater sin of others, which My Father will make to be instrumental in bringing about Redemption." In the counsels of Almighty God the Theocracy had not as yet passed away. It was yet recognized by God in its leaders, since, in virtue of his office, even Caiaphas had prophesied. The veil of the temple was not yet rent. In betraying Christ to Pilate the representatives of the holy people betrayed the Theocracy itself. Because of their greater sin, their utter apostasy, Pilate had power to crucify their king, and the Romans had power to take away their place and nation.

12. "And from thenceforth Pilate sought to release him . . . . speaketh against Cæsar." These words of the Lord still more impressed upon Pilate the mystery connected with Him with Whom he had to deal. Again and again he sought to release Him. The reader will remember the words of St. Peter, how "Pilate was determined to let him go" (Acts iii. 13).

"The Jews cried out, saying, If thou let this man go, thou art

13 ¶ When Pilate therefore heard that saying, he brought Jesus forth, and sat down in the judgment seat in a place that is called the Pavement, but in the Hebrew, Gabbatha.

14 And [k] it was the preparation of the passover, and about the sixth hour: and he saith unto the Jews, Behold your King!

[k] Matt. xxvii. 62.

---

13. "That saying." ℵ, A., B., L., M., Vulg., old Latin, and many versions read, "those sayings."

not," &c. It is to be remarked that it is "the Jews" who thus cry out. The Jews hated the Roman yoke in their hearts, abhorred Cæsar and every sign of his dominion, and yet here we have this "hypocritical nation" zealous for the honour of Cæsar against his own representative. Could national degradation sink lower? We shall soon see that it could. However, the effect on Pilate was at once to dispel any beginnings of religious awe with which the demeanour and the answers of Christ had impressed him, and to make him look wholly to his own safety; for his office, if not his life, would have been in extreme danger if it had been reported at Rome that, at a Jewish Passover time, he had run the risk of exciting a dangerous tumult in his attempts to shield a pretender to the title of king. And so,

13. "When Pilate therefore heard that saying, he brought Jesus forth . . . Gabbatha." He brought Jesus forth, *i.e.*, from the prætorium, in order that he might pass a public sentence.

"The Pavement, but in the Hebrew, Gabbatha." Gabbatha, a high place, is derived from a root signifying "to be put on high," and has nothing to do with the Greek word "pavement." It has been conjectured, but apparently on very slender grounds, that Roman magistrates placed their judgment seats on tesselated pavements which they carried about with them.

14. "And it was the preparation of the passover. . . . Behold your King!" It was the preparation or Paraskeüe (see my note on Matth. xxvi. 2, and on John xviii. 28). It was the Friday on the evening of which the Passover Lamb was killed. At least, so I think St. John would have us understand.

"About the sixth hour." This would be about noon, if the Roman computation of time is used by the Evangelist. But, in this case, there would be an irreconcilable discrepancy between

15 but they cried out, Away with *him*, away with *him*, crucify him. Pilate saith unto them, Shall I crucify your King? The chief priests answered, [1] We have no king but Cæsar.

[1] Gen. xlix. 10.

St. John and St. Mark, who makes the Crucifixion itself to take place at the third hour, *i.e.*, nine o'clock in the morning. It is probable that St. John reckons the hours as we do, beginning at midnight, so that this "bringing of the Lord forth" would be between six and seven o'clock, which would give time for further insults, for the deliverance of our Lord to be crucified, for the sending for the two malefactors, for the slow procession to Golgotha, and for the crucifixion itself, all which would certainly occupy between two and three hours. Again, if we understand St. John by the sixth hour to mean noon, there would not be time for the events of the day, seeing that the Lord surrendered His spirit at the termination of the supernatural darkness, *i.e.*, at the ninth hour (three o'clock).

"And he saith unto the Jews, Behold your King." This was said in irritation as well as in scorn. He was angry because he felt that they knew that by the words, "If thou let this man go thou art not Cæsar's friend," they had excited his fears, and had thrust the responsibility of the Crucifixion on himself, so that he could not now avoid it; but he would have his revenge by ironically insisting both by these words and by the title he afterwards wrote, that the poor exhausted Sufferer, insulted, mocked, with brows bleeding from the thorns, and back lacerated with the thongs, was their King.

15. "But they cried out, Away with him, away with him, crucify him," &c. Again they passionately reject the Lord, and demand His death by torture, and again Pilate ironically, as he and they thought, but as we believe, by the leading of a Higher Power, binds on them the kingship of the Lord, "Your King shall I crucify?"

"The chief priests answered, We have no king but Cæsar." Notice that it is the Sadducean chief priests who thus disclaim the Theocracy in order to compass the death of One Whom they knew to be innocent. No baser national degradation can be conceived. They pronounce with their own lips the abolition of the Theocracy, and the absorption of Israel into the world of the Gentiles. How wonderful is the providence of God in that in the very words which they reject Christ, they reject their country, they reject

16 [m] Then delivered he him therefore unto them to be crucified. And they took Jesus, and led *him* away.

17 [n] And he bearing his cross [o] went forth into a place called *the place* of a skull, which is called in the Hebrew Golgotha:

[m] Matt. xxvii. 26, 31. Mark xv. 15. Luke xxiii. 24.
[n] Matt. xxvii. 31, 33. Mark xv. 21, 22. Luke xxiii. 26, 33.
[o] Num. xv. 36. Heb. xiii. 12.

16. "And led him away." These words omitted by B., L., old Latin, and two or three Cursives, but virtually retained by almost all other authorities; Vulg. (Cod. Amiat.) *et duxerunt;* Syriac (Pesh.) *et eduxerunt.*

their Messianic hopes, they deny their claim to be the one true people of God. This sealed their doom as a nation, and as an hierarchy. "Of their own will they subjected themselves to punishment; therefore also God gave them up, because they were the first to cast themselves out from His providence, and superintendence; and since with one voice they rejected His sovereignty He allowed them to fall by their own suffrages." (Chrysostom.)

16. "Then delivered he him therefore unto them to be crucified." About this time some suppose that Pilate received his last warning in the message of his wife.

"Then delivered he him unto them to be crucified." Not, it seems, to the centurion or to the Roman soldiers; but to the chief priests, to the chief ministers of religion among the people of God; the soldiers, who had nothing to do but to obey orders, were merely the instruments in carrying out the cruel deed. At this time he released Barabbas unto them.

17. "And he bearing his cross went forth into a place called the place of a skull," &c. St. John, having the other gospels before him, says nothing of the bearing of the cross a part of the way by Simon of Cyrene, nor of the Lord's words to the great company of people and of women (Luke xxiii. 27).

But he makes a most suggestive allusion in that he writes of the Lord that "He went forth," thereby reminding us that the Great Sin-bearer must "suffer without the gate." Thus the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, "Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate. Let us go forth therefore unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach" (Heb. xiii. 12, 13). "The place of a skull, which is called," &c. (see note on St. Matth. xxvii. 33).

18 Where they crucified him, and two other with him, n either side one, and Jesus in the midst.

---

18. "Where they crucified him." Thus, simply, and without a ord of comment on the cruelty of the form of execution, or on the atient submission of the Divine Sufferer, does each Evangelist count the commencement of the Redeeming Sacrifice. St. Matthew says: "They crucified him." St. Mark, "when they ad crucified him." St. Luke, "there they crucified him." St. ohn, "Golgotha, where they crucified him."

A Latin writer, Rabanus Maurus, thus speaks of crucifixion: Hanging upon the wood, attached to it with nails driven through eir hands and their feet, they were killed by a protracted death, ad lived a long time on the cross; not because a longer life was n object of choice, but because death itself was lengthened, that eir pain might not be too soon at an end. But the Jews, in hoosing this death for Him, did so only as being the worst of all eaths, but it was chosen by the Lord, while they understood it not: r when He had thus overcome the devil, it was this Cross that He as going to place as His Trophy on the foreheads of the faithful."

The power of the Cross of the Lord Jesus is twofold—atoning and tracting. Its atoning power issues in peace with God (Coloss. i.), for "He has made peace through the Blood of His Cross"; and s attracting power is, that being lifted up He draws our hearts to imself, and if this latter drawing is effectual, we are so drawn to im as to be crucified with Him. "They that are Christ's have ucified the flesh with the affections and lusts." "I am crucified ith Christ; nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.' He himself bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we ing dead to sin should live unto righteousness." (Gal. v. 24, ii. ; 1 Pet. ii. 24.)

"And two other with him, on either side one, and Jesus in the idst." Thus in His Crucifixion was fulfilled the prophecy, "He as numbered with the transgressors." To have suffered crucifixion ould have of itself numbered Him with transgressors, but two en sinners, who for their crimes deserved death were executed ong with Him, so that to those who knew Him not He appeared but one of three great criminals to whom the worst punishment en known had been assigned.

19 ¶ [p] And Pilate wrote a title, and put *it* on the cross. And the writing was, JESUS OF NAZARETH THE KING OF THE JEWS.

p Matt. xxvii. 37. Mark xv. 26. Luke xxiii. 38.

20 This title then read many of the Jews: for the place where Jesus was crucified was nigh to the city: and it was written in Hebrew, *and* Greek, *and* Latin.

---

20. "And Greek and Latin." ℵ, B., L., 33, 74, 89, 90, 234, 248, Sah., Coptic, &c., read "Latin and Greek;" but A., D., later Uncials and most Cursives, old Latin, Vulg., and Syriac have the same order as Received Text.

19. "And Pilate wrote a title, and put it on the cross . . . King of the Jews." Much has been made of the discrepancy between the titles as described by the four Evangelists, but without reason. According to St. Matthew we read, "This is Jesus the King of the Jews;" according to St. Mark, "the King of the Jews;" according to St. Luke, "this is the King of the Jews;" according to St. John, "Jesus of Nazareth the King of the Jews." Of these St. Mark and St. Luke evidently give the same; St. Matthew adds the name "Jesus." St. John, in all probability, gives the inscription as it ran in the vernacular Aramaic. Pilate, desiring to annoy and insult the Jews, would add the words "of Nazareth" or "Nazarene," in their language, because such a word was opprobrious and hateful to them, but it would have no point or meaning to those who read the Greek or Latin, who would know nothing of the contempt attaching to Nazareth.

20. "This title then read many of the Jews: for the place where Jesus," &c. Why is it particularly mentioned that because the place was nigh to the city *many* of the Jews read the title? Evidently because the desire of Pilate was accomplished, that as many as possible of the Jews, *i.e.*, the party of the chief priests, should feel the insult, and the design of One Greater than Pilate was equally accomplished, that the truth of the pretensions of His Son to be a King, the King of Israel, should be acknowledged on His very Cross, in the sight of all. As soon as ever He was born, men inquired for Him in the words, "Where is He that is born King of the Jews?" and in the depth of His humiliation His crucifiers are forced to read the title which proclaimed His Kingship.

"In Hebrew, and Greek, and Latin" (or Latin and Greek). All these languages were commonly used in Jerusalem. The Aramaic

21 Then said the chief priests of the Jews to Pilate, Write not, The King of the Jews; but that he said, I am King of the Jews.

22 Pilate answered, What I have written I have written.

23 ¶ [q] Then the soldiers, when they had crucified Jesus, took his garments, and made four parts, to every soldier a part; and also *his* coat:

q Matt. xxvii. 35. Mark xv. 24. Luke xxiii. 34.

---

23. "Garments." Vulg. *vestimenta.*
"Coat" or "tunic." Vulg., *tunica.*

or Hebrew by the native population, the Greek by the Hellenists and strangers from Egypt and other neighbouring countries; the Latin by the soldiers.

21, 22. "Then said the chief priests of the Jews . . . I have written." It has been shown that this decisive answer of Pilate is in accordance with the inflexibility of his character as described by Philo: but why is special mention made of it? We cannot but connect it with Pilate's former proclamations of Jesus as King of the Jews, which he to this time resolutely persists in, and now embodies in a public document, which, when once affixed, not even the writer could alter.[1] There is a sort of Divine and energetic emphasis in the double declaration. For may we not reasonably suppose that He Who made Caiaphas prophesy because he was the high priest, though he knew not of what he spake, caused Pilate also to write the truth, and emphatically confirm what he had written, because he was a governor, a "power ordained of God"?

23. "Then the soldiers, when they had crucified Jesus, ... did cast lots." The parting of the Lord's garments, and the casting lots are mentioned by all four Evangelists, but by St. John far more circumstantially, for he alone speaks of the "coat" (rather the

---

[1] There is a remarkable quotation from Apuleius in a volume of "Notes on the Four Gospels," &c., by F. M. (Pickering), which runs thus:—"Proconsulis tabella, sententia est; quæ semel lecta neque augeri literâ unâ, neque autem minui potest: sed utcunque recitata, ita provinciæ instrumento refertur." Pilate was no proconsul, but others below that rank may have assumed to put forth such "tabellæ."

now the coat was without seam, || woven from the top
|| Or, *wrought.* throughout.

24 They said therefore among themselves, Let us not rend it, but cast lots for it, whose it shall be: that the
[r] Ps. xxii. 18. scripture might be fulfilled, which saith, [r] They

---

24. "Which saith" omitted by ℵ, B., old Latin (a, b, c, e); but A., D. (l, h., I., L., rest of Uncials and Cursives, Vulg. and Syriac as in Received Text.

inner garment, *ἱματισμός*) which being woven all in one piece they did not rend, but cast lots for. He also (most probably) alone notices that this was the fulfilment of the words in the twenty-second Psalm. (See my note on Matth. xxvii. 35, respecting our Lord using this Psalm in the Synagogue and in the Temple worship).

This inner garment woven without seam has always been held to be a type of the one Holy Catholic Church, in the sight of God one and undivided. Cyprian, in his "Treatise on the Unity of the Church," has a noble passage, which the reader, if he already knows it not, will be thankful to see. "This sacrament of unity, this bond of a concord inseparably cohering, is set forth where, in the Gospel, the coat of the Lord Jesus is not at all divided nor cut, but is received as an entire garment, and is possessed as an uninjured and undivided robe by those who cast lots concerning Christ's garments, who should rather put on Christ. Holy Scripture speaks, saying, 'But of the coat, because it was not sewed, but woven from the top throughout, they said one to another, Let us not rend it, but cast lots whose it shall be.' That coat bore with it an unity which came down from the top, that is, that came down from heaven and the Father, which was not to be at all rent by the receiver and the possessor, but without separation we obtain a whole and substantial entireness. He cannot possess the garment of Christ who parts and divides the Church of Christ. On the other hand, again, when at Solomon's death his kingdom and people were divided, Ahijah the prophet, meeting Jeroboam the king in the field, divided his garment into twelve sections, saying 'Take thee ten pieces: for thus saith the Lord, Behold I will rend the kingdom out of the hand of Solomon, and I will give ten sceptres unto thee: and two sceptres shall be unto him for my servant David's sake, and for Jerusalem the city which I have chosen to place my name there.'

parted my raiment among them, and for my vesture they did cast lots. These things therefore the soldiers did.

25 ¶ [s] Now there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother, and his mother's sister, Mary the *wife* of || [t] Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene.

[s] Matt. xxvii. 55. Mark xv. 40. Luke xxiii. 49.
|| Or, *Clopas*.
[t] Luke xxiv. 18.

25. "Cleophas." Marginal, "Clopas." No MSS. read Cleophas. Variously spelt in versions. Vulg. (Cod. Amiat.) spells it "Cleopas."

As the twelve tribes of Israel were divided the prophet Ahijah rent his garment. But because Christ's people cannot be rent, His robe, woven and united throughout, is not divided by those who possess it: undivided, united, connected, it shows the coherent concord of our people who put on Christ. By the sacrament and sign of His garment, He has declared the unity of the Church" (sec. 7).

"These things therefore the soldiers did"—*i.e.* Roman soldiers who knew not a word of the Jewish Scriptures, did unconsciously the things which fulfilled the prophecy.

25. "Now there stood by the cross of Jesus . . . and Mary Magdalene." It is doubtful whether there are three or four women meant. If three they would be—(1), Mary, His mother; (2), His mother's sister, who was Mary, the wife of Cleophas or Clopas, and (3) Mary Magdalene. Some have a difficulty in believing that two sisters would bear the same name; so the verse has been read as if there were four—(1), Mary, His mother; (2), His mother's sister, the name not being given; (3), Mary, the wife of Clopas, and (4), the Magdalen. The Syriac reads, "And His mother's sister, and Mary the wife of Cleophas." But this is unsupported by any other authorities.

This sister of the Lord's mother is also conjectured to have been Salome, the mother of James and John, and it has been urged in support of this, that as St. John does not mention his own name, so the second of the four women, whose name also he does not give, is his own mother. All this, however, is the merest conjecture. But what is of infinitely more importance, is the example set by the Lord when nailed to the cross as an expiatory sacrifice for the sins of the world. He is not unmindful of the duties and the tenderest ties of human family life. There is one by the Cross to whom,

26 When Jesus therefore saw his mother, and "the disciple
standing by, whom he loved, he saith unto his
mother, [x] Woman, behold thy son!
27 Then saith he to the disciple, Behold thy

u ch. xxii. 23. & xx. 2. & xxi. 7, 20, 24.
x ch. ii. 4.

---

as God, He had given existence, and yet from whom, as very man, He had received His human Nature. It was through her that He was the Son of Man. She had been the willing instrument (Luke i. 38) by which the Son of God had entered into the human family, and could call Himself our Brother; and now in bitterest anguish she was, in very deed, bearing His Cross. The sword was piercing her soul, as it had been predicted (Luke ii. 35). And yet whilst cruel pain was distracting His sacred Body, and the sins of the whole race were heavy on His Soul, full of filial love, He looked upon her and upon him whom He loved: for when "He saw his mother and the disciple standing by whom he loved, he saith unto his mother, Woman, behold thy son! Then saith he to the disciple, Behold thy mother!" And the beloved disciple understood and received the charge, for we read,

"And from that hour that disciple took her," &c. The Lord thus provided a home for her, and a son of all men living the one most worthy to take His place, to care for her, and watch over her. In this He was keeping His Father's and His own commandment to honour father and mother, and He was giving us an example that we should do as He has done. The most illustrious of the Fathers draw this lesson from the Lord's conduct. Thus Chrysostom:—"He on the Cross, committeth His mother to the disciple, teaching us even to our last breath to show every care for our parents. When indeed she unseasonably troubled Him, He said, 'Woman, what have I to do with thee?' and 'Who is my mother?' But here He showed much loving affection, and committeth her to the disciple whom He loved." And Augustine:—"Here then a subject of morals comes in. He is doing that which He admonisheth to be done, and by His own example hath, as the good Teacher, instructed His own that it is the duty of pious sons to have a care for their parents, as though the wood on which were fixed the members of Him that was dying, were even the chair of the Master that was teaching. . . . The Master of the Saints was setting an example in His own practice, when, not as God for the servant

mother! And from that hour that disciple took her [y] unto his own *home*.

[y] ch. i. 11. & xvi. 32.

whom He had created, and was ruling, but as Man for the mother of whom He was born, and whom He was leaving, He provided another to be in some sort a son to her in His stead."

I cannot here help noticing what a remarkable instance we have in the treatment of this touching incident, of how men explain Scripture by what they bring to it rather than by what it really contains and teaches. We have Romish commentators drawing from the words, "Behold thy mother," that St. John is to be considered the representative of the whole Church, and that the Lord here gives the Holy Virgin to be a guiding, instructing, and protecting mother to the whole Church as represented by St. John. But if this be so, how is it that during the infancy of the Church, of which we have the full account in the New Testament, there is such absolute silence respecting her guiding and protecting care? For ages we have no word of any interposition on her part, just as we have no invocation of her power or even intercession. Such men as Chrysostom and Augustine are totally ignorant of any meaning of the words, further than the providing the Virgin with a home, and with a son to cherish her declining years. And, on the other hand, we have ultra-Protestant writers asserting that by the words He now said He divested Himself of all filial relationship to her, making a formal renunciation of her: in fact, so far as the thing was possible, He made as if He had not taken our nature through her. But is this possible? To me it is simply unimaginable that He should cease to regard her as one in whose womb He had dwelt, from whose breasts He had received nourishment, in whose hands He had been lovingly held, and from whom, as a child, He had received His earliest guidance and protection. It seems equivalent to saying, that from this time He ceased to be the Son of Man. As true Son of Man, He must for ever retain all holy human affections, in order that He may truly mediate with reference to all those innumerable matters in our conduct in which human affections come in, and truly sympathize in all those trials and sorrows which spring from the love of relations and friends. He had long ere this taught her that the time was past in which she could command as His mother, but that He should so wipe out the past as to cease to regard her as the mother who bare Him and

28 ¶ After this, Jesus knowing that all things were now
[a] Ps. lxix. 21. accomplished, [z] that the scripture might be fulfilled, saith, I thirst.

29. Now there was set a vessel full of vinegar:

---

28. "Accomplished." Should be rather rendered, "finished," to show its relation to "It is 'finished'" in verse 30.

brought Him up, seems to me incredible. It should be noticed before we conclude this subject, that if she had had any children of her own He would not thus have committed her to St. John, for there would have been others, not only whose privilege but whose duty it would have been to provide a home for her. If it be said that the brethren of the Lord were not believers, still He must have foreseen that in little more than a month they would be (Acts i. 14).

After, or at this time, occurs the supernatural darkness, and the Lord's cry, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

28. "After this, Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished," &c. The words rendered "accomplished" in the twenty-eighth verse, and "finished" in the thirtieth, are the same, and should both be translated "finished." St. Augustine seems to give the meaning: "He saw then that all things were finished which behoved to be done ere He should receive the vinegar and give up the Ghost, and that this also might be finished which the Scripture had foretold, 'And in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink,' He said, 'I thirst.'" All had been done that was written of Him, the betrayal for thirty pieces of silver, the forsaking by all, the buffeting, the stripes, the piercing of the hands and feet, the lifting up to be a gazing-stock, the parting of His garments, the casting lots for His vesture, the mocking, and now the intolerable burning thirst which so often precedes death by loss of blood and protracted agony, seizes the Divine Sufferer. "My strength is dried up like a potsherd, and my tongue cleaveth to my jaws, and thou hast brought me into the dust of death." "To those who have no experience, it might seem strange that thirst should be amongst the last and deadliest symptoms, but such, no doubt, it is. Nothing is more common than for the dying to express it as the last earthly thing they care for, to have their thirst assuaged" (Keble).

29. "Now there was set a vessel full of vinegar: and they filled a spunge with vinegar, and put it upon hyssop [or, 'so they put a

and [a] they filled a sponge with vinegar, and put *it* upon hyssop, and put *it* to his mouth.

[a] Matt. xxvii. 48.

30 When Jesus therefore had received the vine-

---

29. "They filled a sponge with vinegar, and put it upon hyssop." So A. (D. supp.), later Uncials, most Cursives, and Syriac; but ℵ (later correction), B., L., old Latin, "So they put a sponge full of vinegar upon the hyssop." So Revisers.

sponge full of vinegar upon the hyssop' (Vulg., Revisers)] and put it to his mouth." The ancients suppose that this was done in mockery, the taste of the vinegar being bitter and nauseous. Thus Augustine: "He said, I thirst: as much as to say, "This ye have left undone, give what ye are (*i.e.*, bitterness). For indeed the Jews themselves were the vinegar, in their degeneracy from the wine of the patriarchs and prophets." And Chrysostom: "Consider, I pray, the accursed nature of the bystanders. Though we have ten thousand enemies, and have suffered intolerable things at their hands, yet when we see them perishing we relent; but they did not even so make peace with Him, nor were tamed by what they saw, but rather became more savage, and increased their irony; and having brought to Him vinegar on a spunge, as men bring it to the condemned, thus they gave Him to drink." Most modern commentators, on the contrary, suppose that the vinegar was the thin sour wine which the soldiers usually drank, and that it was offered to the Lord out of some slight feeling of pity for His agonies. The word of the Psalm (lxix. 21) seem to imply the truth of the older view.

The Synoptics—St. Matthew and St. Mark—say that the spunge was put on a reed, St. John that it was put on hyssop; but the stalks of hyssop might be of sufficient length and firmness to hold a small piece of wet spunge. Probably they found such a stalk growing near the spot.

30. "When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, he said, It is finished." "In one human word did our Lord gather into one all which He had willed, and wrought, and suffered for man's salvation. 'Finished' was the determinate counsel of God: 'finished' all that prophecy had foretold and type foreshadowed, and patriarchs and righteous men had longed to see, and angels desired to look into; 'finished' the work which His Father gave Him to do, and the deliverance He had wrought in the earth; 'finished' were all the sufferings which the malice of man or of Satan could inflict, and

gar, he said, [b] It is finished: and he bowed his head, and gave up the ghost.

[b] ch. xvii. 4.

31 The Jews therefore, [c] because it was the preparation, [d] that the bodies should not remain upon

[c] ver. 42. Mark xv. 42.
[d] Deut. xxi. 23.

---

the cup of His Father's wrath; 'finished' the transgression, and an end made to sin; 'finished' the one Sacrifice for sin, and the mortal Life of God made man, the victory over Satan, his rule, and our enthralment." (Pusey.) But a perverse use has been made of these most precious words to deprive the Eucharist of its sacrificial character. The Sacrifice for sin was finished, so far as its expiatory pains were concerned, for "a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction had been made for the sins of the whole world." But the great work of applying that Sacrifice to men, and representing it before God, had not yet begun, and could not till the High Priest had ascended and taken his seat at the right Hand of God. The expiatory Sacrifice must be followed by the eucharistic Oblation, in which we "show forth the Lord's death till He come." The Lamb of God, once for all slain, must be seen at the right Hand of God, standing as slain. The Divine Victim must be fed upon by the faithful.

"And he bowed his head, and gave up the ghost," or delivered up His Spirit. The giving up the ghost, or the delivering up of His Spirit, was a voluntary act on His part. His natural strength was not exhausted, for it was as He cried with a loud voice that He commended His Spirit into His Father's Hands. "When the flesh was failing," says St. Jerome, "the Divine voice was strong. While we who are of the earth die with lowest voice, or with no voice at all, He Who was from heaven expired with an exalted cry."

"He bowed his head, and gave up the ghost." "Who so sleeps when he will, as Jesus died when He would? Who so lays aside his clothing when he will, as He put off the flesh when He would? Who so departs from a place when he will, as He departed this life when He would? What must we hope or fear to find His power when He judgeth, as it was seen to be so great when He died?" (Augustine.)

31. "The Jews therefore, because it was the preparation," &c. In the law of God (Deut. xxi. 22) it is written, "If a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be put to death, and

the cross on the sabbath day, (for that sabbath day was an high day,) besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and *that* they might be taken away.

32 Then came the soldiers, and brake the legs of the first, and of the other which was crucified with him.

33 But when they came to Jesus, and saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs:

---

31. "For that sabbath day was an high day." More literally, "For great was the day of that sabbath."

thou hang him on a tree, his body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt in any wise bury him that day, for he that is hanged is accursed of God, that thy land be not defiled." The Jews not only having regard to this law, but also to the fact that the Sabbath, which began at six o'clock that evening, was one of peculiar solemnity (being at once the weekly Sabbath and in that year the day on which the passover was eaten, and so no work of any sort, more particularly so defiling a work as the taking down and burying of dead bodies, should be done upon it), came to Pilate and besought him that the three bodies should be taken down, having first, according to the cruel custom, had their legs broken, to make death the more certain; so that, when cast alive, it may be, into the grave, they should not escape. Some, however, suppose that the breaking of their legs immediately produced gangrene, and so death, but this seems unlikely.

32. "Then came the soldiers, and brake . . . . which was crucified with him." To account for the mention of the two separately, it has been suggested that the soldiers, four in number, came to the bodies in pairs, two doing the cruel work on each of the outside bodies; but may there not be a hint of the essential difference in character between the two? the one, the nobler, here called "the first," and "the other," the impenitent one who was crucified with his believing comrade.

33. "But when they came to Jesus, and saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs." It is important to note this, as it seems to tell us that the Lord was dead before the soldiers came up to the bodies. It is hardly possible to suppose that He could have cried with the loud voice, and surrendered His Spirit whilst they were breaking the legs of those crucified with Him.

34 But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side,
[e] 1 John v. 6, 8. and forthwith [e] came thereout blood and water.

---

34. "But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side." If this soldier had been the centurion, it is most probable that the fact would have been mentioned; or, at least, such an one having been so astonished at the signs which accompanied the Lord's death as to exclaim, "Truly this man was the Son of God," was not likely to have thus insulted the Body of the Lord. That it was done as a last and crowning indignity was believed by the Fathers, one of whom (Chrysostom) writes: "Yet these (soldiers) to gratify the Jews, pierced His Side with a spear, and now insulted the dead Body."

"And forthwith came there out blood and water." It is perfectly clear from the next verse in what light (natural or supernatural) we are to regard this coming forth of blood and water from the side of the Saviour. For the Apostle vouches for the truth of the fact in one of the most solemn asseverations to be found in the whole compass of the Scriptures. "He that saw it bare record, and his record is true, and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye may believe." It is absurd to suppose that he would have made so reiterated a declaration, if the phenomenon was one which would or might have occurred in the case of any other dead body similarly suspended. For it appears from many authorities that in such a case, even if the heart were pierced, there would flow forth a very little blood and a still less quantity of a fluid which could not properly be called "water"; and unless by a special interposition, amounting in fact to a miracle, these would flow forth mingled together, and undistinguishable from one another—the red particles of the blood giving their colour to all that came forth from the wound. For the thrust of the spear, before reaching the heart, would pierce part of the lungs and many smaller vessels, and after passing through the pericardium, in which there would be a little colourless fluid, would penetrate the larger blood-vessels, and the blood of both these would naturally mingle with and discolour any other fluid before it could begin to flow from the wound. Such a stream could not possibly flow forth so as to be distinguished by a bystander as two separate liquids, and dwell in his memory as one of the most remarkable facts of a day such as had never been known before in the history of the world.

35 And he that saw *it* bare record, and his record is true:

Considering, then, the impossibility, on any natural hypothesis, of any such flow of blood and water so distinguishable from one another, as to command attention as something unique, and require, as if it were something incredible, a very solemn twofold assertion on the part of the narrator to enable it to be received, there can be no doubt but that he intended it to be regarded as a fact at once supernatural and typical. And to those who believe that that Body was the Body which the Eternal Son of God had assumed, that its Pains and Death had redeemed the world, and that it was destined within three days to rise again to be the fountain of Life to the world, it seems only likely so to be. What the natural explanation of such a phenomenon connected with such a Body is it seems profane to inquire.[1] Not so with its typical or mystical significance. This we are bound reverently and devoutly to look into, for the Apostle sets it forth as a matter of faith. "He knoweth that he saith true, that ye may believe." We seem to have the key to such meaning in the 1st Epistle of this Evangelist, when, with evident reference to what he had seen at the foot of the Cross, he wrote, "This is he that came by water and blood, not by water only, but by water and blood." Now, why should he contrast "coming by water only," and "coming by water and blood"? Evidently because he had in his mind the contrast between the mission of the Baptist and the mission of Christ. The mission of the Baptist was in water only: "I baptize with water." The mission of the Lord is with "water and Blood." What is the significance of water? Evidently cleansing. What is the significance of the Blood? Evidently Life—"the blood is the life." The Lord comes not with cleansing only, but with cleansing and life, and

---

[1] Godet has a very good remark: "The Apostle, therefore, establishes, as we have said, the exceptional state of the Body of Jesus, which was manifested at this time by an unexampled evidence. The Holy One of God was not to see corruption (Ps. xvi.), and this promise must be fulfilled perfectly in the case of the perfect Holy One. Now, it implied the beginning of the work of Resurrection at the very moment when, in the case of every other death, the crisis of dissolution begins."

and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe.

36 For these things were done,[f] that the scrip-

[f] Ex. xii. 46. Num. ix. 12. Ps. xxxiv. 20.

35. "That ye might believe." So a few later Uncials and most Cursives; but ℵ, A., B., D. (supp.), H., K., L., old Latin, Vulg., Syriac read, "That ye also might believe."

each of these proceeding from His own blessed Person. This piercing of the Body of the Lord from which the Blood and Water flowed is parallel to the rending of the veil in the Synoptical Gospels. Just as the rending of the veil was supernatural and also mystical, betokening access to God through the Flesh of Christ, so this flowing of Blood and Water from His pierced Side was also supernatural and mystical, denoting that henceforth His glorified human Nature should be a fountain of cleansing and life.

Is there, then, any adumbration of the Sacraments? Undoubtedly: because the Sacraments are ordained to convey cleansing and life from the glorified Body of the Second Adam. Many of the Fathers think that the second element in the Eucharist is signified by the blood and the water, but however this may be, the grace and truth of Holy Baptism are most certainly set forth, for in that Sacrament we are sanctified and cleansed with the washing of water by the Word. It is to us the washing of Regeneration. It is our engrafting into the Second Adam, so that we may partake of His Life. That our branch of the Church would have us hold that there is a reference to this Sacrament is certain from her appeal in our Baptismal Service, to "God, Whose most dearly beloved Son, for the forgiveness of our sins, did shed out of His most precious Side both water and blood."

"And he that saw it bare record . . . . that ye might believe." Here we have, as I have shown, the Apostle's most solemn declaration, not only of the truth of the fact, but of the necessity laid upon us to realize it by a living faith, "that ye may believe"—"that ye may believe that this supernatural and mysterious sign marked out this Death as a Death very different from all others, and assures you of cleansing and life flowing from His Body to those who by faith stand under His Cross:" and he proceeds to cite two Scriptures to confirm our faith.

"For these things were done, that the scripture should be," &c. These things were done to assure us that He is the true Paschal Lamb Whose Flesh and Blood we are to eat and drink in order to

ture should be fulfilled, A bone of him shall not be broken.

37 And again another scripture saith, [g] They shall look on him whom they pierced.

38 ¶ [h] And after this Joseph of Arimathæa, being a disciple of Jesus, but secretly [i] for fear of the Jews, besought Pilate that he might take away the body of Jesus: and Pilate gave *him* leave. He came therefore, and took the body of Jesus.

39 And there came also [k] Nicodemus, which at

g Ps. xxii. 16, 17. Zech. xii. 10. Rev. i. 7.

h Matt. xxvii. 57. Mark xv. 42. Luke xxiii. 50.

i ch. ix. 22. & xii. 42.

k ch. iii. 1, 2. & vii. 50.

---

continue in the unity of His Church, and for the strengthening and refreshing of our souls thereby.

37. "And again another scripture saith, . . . whom they pierced." This is written in Zechariah xii. 10. The Hebrew reads, "They shall look on Me whom they have pierced." The Septuagint translators, no doubt feeling the difficulty of the words "piercing Me," altered "pierced" into "mocked." "They shall look on Me because they have mocked Me." St. John renders it, "They shall look on Him [or Me] Whom they have pierced." Whether, however, we read "Him," or "Me," it is the same Lord. The Jews then looked upon the Pierced One with contempt and unbelief, but from the words of the Prophet we believe that the day will come when they will look to Him in repentance and deep contrition: and the day will also come when all men will see Him Whom their sins have pierced. (Rev. i. 7.)

38. "And after this Joseph of Arimathæa, . . . took the body of Jesus." John, writing the account of what was done by one well known, omits all mention of his being "an honourable counsellor" (Mark xv. 43)—"a good man and a just, who waited for the kingdom of God" (Luke xxiii. 50, 51)—and simply records that he was "a disciple, but secretly for fear of the Jews."

39. "And there came also Nicodemus . . . hundred pound weight." Nicodemus is not named in the Synoptics, but only by St. John, and by him three times, and in each case mention is made of his coming to Jesus by night (iii. 2, vii. 50, and here). It is to be borne in mind that the acts of these two good men showed love and devoted remembrance rather than faith. Like all the rest of his disciples,

the first came to Jesus by night, and brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pound *weight*.

40 Then took they the body of Jesus, and [1]wound it in linen clothes with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury.

[1] Acts v. 6.

41 Now in the place where he was crucified there was

---

39. "A mixture." So nearly all authorities; but ℵ and B. read, "a roll"—the two words, *migma*, mixture, and *eligma*, roll, being easily confounded.

40. "Linen clothes." Properly, "cloths." Vulg., *linteis*.

they had no anticipation whatever of His Resurrection (see note on Matth. xxvii. 58-62). It is difficult to realize what must have been their thoughts and feelings respecting Him. They believed, no doubt, that He was a Prophet sent by God, and that His miracles showed this, but that like Isaiah, or the Baptist, He had been a martyr for the truth, and that God would bring about that though His Body should be embalmed and buried, His teaching and the memory of His miracles and example should live.

Still God accepted this their love and devotion, and in due time, we doubt not, turned it into faith in a Risen and Exalted Saviour, and it was a great and noble thing thus openly to avow their belief that He was the "Just One," and that their chief priests and fellow rulers had done wickedly in crucifying Him.

40. "Then took they the body . . . . manner of the Jews is to bury." Not as those nations who burned their dead, or as the Egyptians, who removed the entrails, and laid the body in nitre.

41. "Now in the place . . . . never man yet laid." St. John does not mention that the sepulchre belonged to Joseph of Arimathæa. St. Matthew alone records this fact, though it seems to be implied in the narratives of St. Mark and St. Luke. St. Luke and St. John unite in saying that it had never before received any dead body. The fact that Joseph was in possession of such a sepulchre, and that it was very near the place of Crucifixion, probably suggested to him that he should ask of Pilate the Body of the Lord. If the sepulchre had not been near, the Lord's Body could not, most probably, have been placed in it before the commencement of the Sabbath.

"There was a garden," &c. St. John alone mentions that the

a garden; and in the garden a new sepulchre, wherein was never man yet laid.

42 [m]There laid they Jesus therefore [n]because of the Jews' preparation *day*; for the sepulchre was nigh at hand.

[m] Is. liii. 1, 9.
[n] ver. 31.

Lord was buried in a garden. "The sepulchre of Christ was in a garden, because in the garden of Paradise Adam had sinned and incurred the sentence of death. Hence in a garden the Passion of Christ was commenced, and in a garden it was finished, and He was buried that he might expiate this sentence, and institute and plant a garden most pleasant, blooming with flowers and fruits—that is, His Church." (Cornelius à Lapide.) Dean Burgon notices how some of the Fathers refer to Luke xiii. 19, where we have the grain of mustard-seed, which "a man took and cast into his garden." Men will esteem these things worthy or unworthy of notice according as they realize or not that He Who suffered was the Word made flesh; that all the circumstances of His Passion were foreseen and a great number foretold; and that by such resemblances and contrasts God has sought to impress the deepest truths on the souls of His best servants.

Introductory Remarks on the Gospel of the Resurrection, as set forth by St. John.

The notices of the Lord's Resurrection in the Gospel of St. John seem to have been written to confirm the accounts given by other of the Evangelists in some matters of great importance; and, above all, to give to the appearances of His Risen Body their full significance.

1. They confirm and emphasize the fact that the first tidings of the Lord's Resurrection were given by angels to women, and that the first appearance of the Lord, after He had risen, was to a woman. The Apostles were evangelized by women. Peter and John were at the sepulchre, entered it, and observed the state in which the Lord had left it, and yet they were not the first to see

the Lord. It was given to Mary Magdalene, a penitent, first to see the Risen Saviour. The Lord here establishes the fact that His Gospel is for penitent sinners.

2. Then we learn from the accounts in this Gospel, far more perfectly than from those of the other Evangelists, the nature of the Lord's Risen Body—that it was a spiritual Body, capable of passing through all obstacles, and so had power and functions far transcending all properties of mere matter. In St. Luke's account we read that when the Ten were gathered together on the evening of the first Easter Day, Jesus suddenly stood in the midst; but from St. John's account we learn that this took place in spite of the doors being shut because of the Jews—so that walls and barred doors presented no obstacles to the entrance of a frame which, being capable of being felt and handled, was yet a body. This bears upon two great doctrines of the faith. It proves to us that God's Almighty power can bring about the existence of that spiritual body in which we shall ourselves one day be clothed, for "when He shall appear we shall be like Him," and "He shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body, according to the working whereby He is able to subdue all things to Himself." (1 John iii. 2, Phil. iii. 21.)

It also bears very directly upon the Eucharistic mystery, for it makes the doctrine taught in John vi., that we are to eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood, in the eye of faith, conceivable. It is inconceivable that, if the Lord's Body had remained under the conditions under which it existed previous to His Resurrection, it should of itself, as a Body, have any faculties of a higher order than our present gross bodies have; but now that He has risen in a spiritual Body, having the properties assumed in St. John's Gospel, we cannot take into account the limitations of our present natural bodies in realizing the mode of communication of the Lord's Flesh and Blood proffered to us for such purposes as are set forth in the discourse at Capernaum.

3. Then we learn from the words of the Lord in this Gospel the fulness of the powers of the Apostolic commission. This commission was to act towards sinners and towards the Church for Him—in His place, inasmuch as He was no longer to be visibly present. In the Synoptic Gospels this commission was principally to baptize and to teach, but from St. John's account of Christ's words we learn that it extended to representing Him fully in all

offices in which it was possible, in the nature of things, that He could be represented. "As My Father sent Me, so send I you," and He then proceeds to specify that their commission should be to the extent of representing Him in that function of absolving sinners from sin which had drawn down upon Himself such opposition: "Whosesoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whosesoever sins ye retain they are retained." He had expressly told them before (Matth. xvi. 19, xviii. 18) that their commission should reach thus far, and now He makes good His word.

4. And in the last place the account in St. John gives us the full significance of the testimony of the Resurrection to the Divine claims of Christ. From the Synoptics we gather that His disciples worshipped Him. But in St. John we read that He accepted from one of His followers (and that one the most slow to believe) the titles of God and Lord, and accepted them as signs of that faith in His Divine Nature which was His due. In what way the reality of His risen Body proved His claim to be Lord and God, we shall consider when we come to the passage.

So that in St. John's Gospel we have the full significance of the Lord's Resurrection.

CHAP. XX.

THE [a]first *day* of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulchre, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre.

[a] Matt. xxviii. 1. Mark xvi. 1. Luke xxiv. 1.

---

1. "The first *day* of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet," &c. "Mary Magdalene." St. John mentions Mary Magdalene only as coming to the sepulchre. St. Matthew mentions her and "another Mary." St. Mark, "Mary Magdalene, and Mary, the mother of James and Salome." According to St. Luke (xxiv. 10) there was a large company who told of the appearance and message of the angel.

Mary Magdalene was among those who came first to the sepulchre,

2 Then she runneth, and cometh to Simon Peter, and to the [b] other disciple, whom Jesus loved, and saith unto them, They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid him.

[b] ch. xiii. 23. & xix. 26. & xxi. 7, 20, 24.

3 [c] Peter therefore went forth, and that other disciple, and came to the sepulchre.

[c] Luke xxiv. 12.

4 So they ran both together: and the other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulchre.

5 And he stooping down, *and looking in,* saw [d] the linen clothes lying; yet went he not in.

[d] ch. xix. 40.

---

3. "Came to the sepulchre:" rather, "went towards" (Alford and Revisers).

5, 6, 7. For "clothes" read "cloths," such as a body would be wrapped in. Vulg., *linteamina.*

but seeing from a distance the stone rolled away, she ran to tell the Apostles Peter and John, leaving the rest of the women at the sepulchre.

"When it was yet dark." This was when they set out, but the daylight would increase very rapidly, so that before she arrived there was light sufficient to show that the heavy stone had been removed. Taking for granted that the sepulchre had been opened in order to take away the Lord's Body, she ran to tell the Apostles.

2. "Then she runneth, and cometh to Simon Peter . . . where they have laid him." Simon Peter was with St. John, in his house, to which he had taken the Virgin.

3, 4. "Peter therefore went forth, and that other disciple . . . first to the sepulchre." St. Matthew and St. Mark say nothing of any visit of any Apostle to the tomb. St. Luke (assuming that verse 12 is genuine) tells us that St. Peter went in and observed the order in which the linen clothes were lying, and came away in silent wonder. St. John alone gives full details of this visit. He mentions that "they ran both together," and being the younger he outran Peter, and "came first to the sepulchre."

5. "And he stooping down and looking in," &c., "yet went he not in," restrained, no doubt, by a feeling of awe and reverence for the place where He Whom he regarded as his Lord had been laid.

6 Then cometh Simon Peter following him, and went into the sepulchre, and seeth the linen clothes lie,

7 And [e] the napkin, that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself.

[e] ch. xi. 44.

8 Then went in also that other disciple, which came first to the sepulchre, and he saw, and believed.

9 For as yet they knew not the [f] scripture, that he must rise again from the dead.

[f] Ps. xvi. 10. Acts ii. 25-31. & xiii. 34, 35.

---

6. "Then cometh Simon Peter following him, and went into the sepulchre," &c. Having more animal courage, as was evinced by his conduct on the occasion of the Lord's capture.

7. "And the napkin," &c. If the Lord's Body had been taken away by His enemies, it would have been with some evil design, and the linen cloths and the napkin would not have been left in such order. "There were no indications of haste, none of evil design or force, but rather like the appearance of a bed which a person had quitted for his morning's rise." (Luthardt.) ("I laid me down and slept, and rose up again, for the Lord sustained me.")

8. "Then went in also that other disciple, ... saw, and believed." This is very noticeable. St. Peter, who was the first to see the ordered state of what was in the sepulchre, did not realize the cause of it all. St. John did. Very probably he said little or nothing; but the truth flashed upon him, that the emptiness of the sepulchre was not the effect of violence or robbery, or of the officiousness of friends, but of the Lord's power in fulfilment of His very distinct and oft-repeated assertion. "He saw and believed;" but what, then, is the meaning of the next verse,

9. "For as yet they knew not the scripture," &c.? Evidently this. Neither of them believed on the authority of Scripture, which was the one ground on which (connected with the Lord's constant reference to everything respecting Himself as being foretold in Scripture) their faith ought to have rested; but the one suspended, as it were, his belief till he received more evidence, and the other remembered the Lord's words, and so accounted in himself for what he saw.

In all probability the belief of St. John was at this time very

10 Then the disciples went away again unto their own home.

s Mark xvi. 5. 11 ¶ s But Mary stood without at the sepul-

---

vague and indefinite. We may say, I think, with absolute certainty, that at this time it never crossed his mind that in this world he should see the Lord; but he certainly believed that the Lord had risen, not spiritually, or in any unreal way, but in the Body.

Yet it is very important that we should take these words as teaching that St. John really believed, for this belief on St. John's part is one of the principal facts which dispose of the notion that our Lord's appearances were regulated not by His will and infinite wisdom, but according to some psychological law: so that, whether He desired it or not, He should appear to those and only those who believed in Him; the Lord's appearance in each case being dependent upon the interior state of the person favoured;—in fact (the word must be said), to those who were "en rapport" with Him. This is one of the foundations of the absurd but mischievous vision theory, which is that they who believed in Him imagined that they saw Him, and so they mistook the phantom of their imagination for reality. But if there be any such a law, why did He not first appear to St. John, who undoubtedly first believed, and, we may be sure, loved the Lord as well, and, no doubt, more intelligently, than the Magdalen? Yet there was no appearance to St. John alone, whereas the first appearance (after those to the women) was to Cephas, who certainly was, in the matter of belief in the Resurrection, inferior to St. John.

11. "But Mary stood without at the sepulchre weeping." Peter and John had returned home, but Mary stood without towards the sepulchre weeping. The disciples had departed, one believing that the Lord had risen. They lingered not at the empty tomb, feeling that nothing could be done there. They waited for the assembling of the whole Apostolic company that evening, remembering, perhaps, how earnestly the Lord had prayed for their unity, which could not be without their meeting and praying together; and that, where His disciples were gathered in His name, there was He.

But Mary, full of a grateful and loving woman's grief, remained weeping—weeping because the Body of her Lord was not there; unconscious that, if it had been there, she would have had to weep

chre weeping: and as she wept, she stooped down, *and looked* into the sepulchre.

12 And seeth two angels in white sitting, the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had laid.

13 And they say unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? She saith unto them, Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him.

---

for faith quenched, and hope lost, in the darkness of eternal night. How little, till He teaches us, know we the significance of God's dealings! If the Body had been in the sepulchre, the Lord's word would have been falsified, and not one promise could have been relied on; that the sepulchre was empty was the assurance of everlasting life.

"And as she wept, she stooped down, and looked in." Literally, she stooped into the sepulchre.

12. "And seeth two angels in white sitting," &c. "Seeth," rather "beholdeth"—the word having the signification of a more intent look. "She stood at the place, for, as I have said, even the sight of the tomb tended greatly to comfort her. At any rate, thou seest her, the more to ease her grief, stooping down, and desiring to behold the place where the Body lay." (Chrysostom.)

"And seeth two angels in white sitting, the one at the head," &c. This position of the angels, with respect to the place where the Lord's Body was laid, particularly struck her, inasmuch as we read in St. Mark that Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of Joses, *beheld* where He was laid. (xv. 47.)

13. "And they say unto her . . . I know not where they have laid him." Is it possible to think that she realized them to be angels? It has been said that the intensity of her love was such that, though she knew them to be angels, she took no notice of their presence; but is her recognition of them as angelic beings consistent with the reply she made to their question, "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where," &c.? Would she not instantly have assumed that, being angels of God, and sitting in the very place where she had seen the Lord's Body laid, they knew how it had been removed, and would she not have at once asked

14 [h] And when she had thus said, she turned herself back,
and saw Jesus standing, and [i] knew not that it
was Jesus.

15 Jesus saith unto her, Woman, why weepest

h Matt. xxviii. 9. Mark xvi. 9.
i Luke xxiv. 16, 31. ch. xxi. 4.

---

them where it was? If it be answered that she could not, from their form, have any doubt, it may be sufficient to rejoin that, in the gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke, they are described simply as men. St. Mark writes: "They saw a young man" (*νεανίσκον*). And St. Luke says: "Two men (*ἄνδρες*) stood by them in shining garments." We are to remember that the conventional figure of angels as winged men is nowhere recognized in Scripture; and it is certain that, at times, they were seen, and not recognized by those to whom they were sent (Judges vi. 22; xiii. 6, 10, 11, 16, 21).

14. "And when she had thus said . . . knew not that it was Jesus." The Fathers give as a reason why she suddenly turned herself back, that she saw the angels arise when the Lord drew near. Thus Chrysostom: "Methinks that, while she was speaking, Christ suddenly appeared behind her, struck the angels with awe; and that they, having beheld their Ruler, showed immediately by their bearing, their look, their movements that they saw the Lord; and this drew the woman's attention, and caused her to turn herself backward."

"Knew not that it was Jesus." Not because of the darkness of the morning, as some suggest, or from such change in His personal appearance, owing to His crucifixion, as others; but because He willed not at once to be recognized by her, just as the two on the road to Emmaus did not know Him till He removed the veil from their eyes. "The essential cause is to be found in the mysterious alteration of the corporeity, and of the appearance of Jesus, which manifests itself from His Resurrection onwards; so that He comes and disappears in a marvellous way; the identity of His Person is doubted, and then recognized." (Meyer.)

15. "Jesus saith unto her, Woman, why weepest thou?" &c. This was the first appearance of the Lord; and so these words are His first words after His Resurrection to any child of Adam. Such words of His, said at such a time, must be of universal and eternal application. "Mary Magdalene, standing by the grave, and there weeping, represents to us the state of all mankind, before the day

thou? whom seekest thou? She, supposing him to be the gardener, saith unto him, Sir, if thou have borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away.

16 Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turned herself, and saith unto him, Rabboni; which is to say, Master.

---

16. "Saith unto him." So A., E., G., K., M., most Cursives, some old Latin (a, f, g), Vulg.; but ℵ, B., D., L., several Cursives, some old Latin (b, c, e, ff), and many versions read, "Said unto Him in Hebrew."

of Christ's rising again; weeping over the dead, as do the heathen who have no hope. But Christ comes and asks, '*Why weepest thou?*' As much as to say, 'Weep not. There is no cause of weeping now.' Henceforth, none shall stand by the grave to weep there any more. So that this question of Christ's, 'Why weepest thou?' wipes away all tears from all eyes, puts off our mourning weeds, girds us with gladness, and robes us all in white with the angels." (Bp. Andrewes.)

And so with the words, "Whom seekest thou?" Seekest thou the Lord of Life in the mansions of the dead?

"She, supposing him to be the gardener." The keeper of the garden rather than the cultivator. Being in the employment of Joseph of Arimathæa, he would be a friend. And so she said:

"Sir, if thou hast borne him hence, tell me," &c. St. Gregory (quoted by I. Williams) well remarks on the omission of our Lord's name by the Magdalen: "The force of love has usually this effect upon the mind, that it supposes that he whom itself is always thinking of, no one else can be ignorant of."

Notice, also, how to this point, the very moment before the Lord revealed Himself, it never crossed her mind that the Lord's Body was not held by death.

16. "Jesus said unto her, Mary." Now He speaks to her in His well-known voice, in the wonted accent. "The most personal thing in human manifestations is the sound of the voice; it is thus that Jesus makes Himself known to her. The tone which the name Mary takes in His mouth expresses all that she is to Him, and all that He is to her." (Godet.)

Here we have the most striking illustration conceivable of the Lord's words: "He calleth his own sheep by name." It is when He spiritually and effectually does this that they recognize Him.

17 Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not

"She turned herself, and saith unto him, Rabboni." "Rabboni," my Master. This was her word of recognition, for it was doubtless the word by which she addressed Him before His Crucifixion and Resurrection.

17. "Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended," &c. These words are very difficult on two accounts—first, because of the Lord's reason, "I am not yet ascended to my Father;" and, secondly, because He apparently permitted other women, and He required St. Thomas, to touch Him.

If the Lord had only given the reason, "I am not yet ascended to my Father," and the Evangelists had recorded nothing respecting others touching Him, we should have naturally explained the words as meaning that there was something in the nature of His Resurrection Body, that it should not be touched by fleshly hands. We must touch Him by faith only. We must apprehend Him in the devout use of the means He has ordained for bringing about His presence.

But women were permitted to hold Him by the feet (Matth. xxviii. 9); and, to St. Thomas the Lord said: "Reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into My side."

Upon the first of these instances it may be observed, that it is by no means certain that there was any difference between our Lord's conduct to the women, related in Matthew xxviii., and to the Magdalen. Commentators are universally agreed that the Greek word for "touch" means "cling to," rather than merely touch. It may be that the devout affection of the Magdalen would lead her to hold Him, so as to detain Him. And so, to repress the too human manifestation of her love, He said, "Touch Me not. Cling not to Me. It is of more importance that you at once bear My message to My sorrowing disciples than that you thus cling to My feet."

Some commentators have held (and it is certainly not improbable and clears up some difficulties) that St. Matthew and St. John refer to the same incident; but that St. Matthew's account is imperfect and fragmentary, whilst St. John gives in full what occurred to Mary Magdalene as taking the lead. However, St. Matthew's account seems to imply that He allowed the women to embrace His feet for a very brief moment, and at once dismissed them with the message to the Apostles.

et ascended to my Father: but go to [k] my brethren, and say unto them, [l] I ascend unto my Father.

[k] Ps. xxii. 22. Matt. xxviii. 10. Rom. viii. 29. Heb. ii. 11.
[l] ch. xvi. 28.

17. "To my Father." So A., L., most later Uncials, Cursives, old Latin (a, c, f, g), Vulg., Syriac, most versions; but ℵ, B., D., old Latin (b, e), read, "the Father."

With respect to the command to touch His wounded Side, given to St. Thomas, the reason was so very different that the two cannot be compared together—the one being for the satisfaction of faith, the other for the repression of undue zeal.

But neither of these surmises take into account the reason given by the Lord Himself: "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father."

Taking this to be the key to explain the prohibition, two explanations have been given—one naturalistic, the other mystical.

The first of these, singularly enough, is that held by many Romanist commentators—Cornelius à Lapide, Vetablus, Suarez, and Ribera. It is well expressed by the last. "The Magdalen knew that Christ would ascend into heaven, and that afterwards she could not enjoy the sight of Him. So she was unwilling to lose the opportunity now afforded her of touching the Lord. But He said to her, 'Touch me not,' as if He said, 'Henceforth, you will have opportunities both of touching Me, and conversing with Me, for I yet linger upon earth, nor am I yet ascended into heaven; wherefore delay not thus, but make my Apostles partakers of the joy which you possess, for it is not fitting that you alone should enjoy the knowledge of My Resurrection, but go,'" &c.

The second interpretation, which is mystical or sacramental, may be expressed thus: "Linger not now to embrace Me with thy bodily hands. Another and a better touch is in store for those who love Me, which touch cannot be till I have ascended. When you have seen Me ascend up where I was before, then not merely My Godhead, nor My Spiritual Nature, but My very Flesh, spiritualized and glorified, shall be present, and be given to the faithful. Then you shall touch Me with a far more effectual touch the touch of faith." It is, however, impossible to conceive that, in her then state of knowledge, she could have thus apprehended His words.

"But go to my brethren, and say unto them," &c. See note on Matthew xxviii. 10. Before they were His disciples, His sheep, and

m Ephes. i. 17. and your Father; and to m my God, and your God.

n Matt. xxviii. 10. Luke xxiv. 10. 18 n Mary Magdalene came and told the disciples that she had seen the Lord, and *that* he had spoken these things unto her.

o Mark xvi. 14. Luke xxiv. 36. 1 Cor. xv. 5. 19 ¶ o Then the same day at evening, being

---

18. "That she had seen the Lord." So A., D., I., L., later Uncials, Cursives, old Latin (b, c, e, f), Syriac; but ℵ, B., old Latin (a), Vulg., "I have seen the Lord." Vulg., *Venit Maria Magdalene annuncians discipulis quia vidit Dominum*, &c.

19. "Then the same day at evening." "When it was evening therefore, on that same day" (Alford). Vulg., *Cum ergo sero esset die illo, una sabbatorum.*

latterly His friends; now He calls them, as He had never before done, His brethren. All is forgiven.

"I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God." The words of Augustine on this verse are quoted by almost every commentator. "He saith not, 'Unto our Father;' consequently, in one sort Mine, in another yours: by nature Mine, by grace yours. 'And unto my God, and your God.' Neither saith He here, 'Our God;' consequently, here also, in one sense, Mine, in another yours. 'My God, under Whom am I also a Man; your God, between whom and Him I am Mediator.'"

It is to be noted that neither St. Paul, nor St. John, nor any other servant of Christ, is ever said to call God, "My Father." It is the sole prerogative of the Only-Begotten to say, "My Father." All other servants of God say, "Our Father," as joining their brethren with themselves in all their approaches to God: for so had Christ taught them when He bid them say, "Our Father, which art in heaven."

18. "Mary Magdalene came and told . . . spoken these things unto her." Mary Magdalene, apparently, makes no reply—"deep and trembling adoration, of which silence would be the only expression, must have taken the place of her devout anxieties."

A question arises—were the Apostles all collected together when she came to tell them? It is generally assumed that they were, but it seems very doubtful. From St. John's account, as well as from St. Luke's, we should gather that it was evening before they were all together (Luke xxiv. 33).

19. "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the

the first *day* of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came

---

19. "Were assembled." So most later Uncials, E., G., K., L., M., S., U., &c., most Cursives, old Latin (b, c, e, f, g); but ℵ, A., B., D., old Latin (a), Vulg. (Cod. Amiat.), omit "assembled."

week." *The* day as being the day of the Resurrection, the first day of the new order of things, is far more emphasized in the order of the original than in our translation. It may be rendered, "When therefore it was evening on that day, the first day of the week." It must have been somewhat later in the evening to allow of the return of the two from Emmaus. (Luke xxiv. 33.)

"When the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled," &c. It is a matter of thankfulness to find that almost all believing commentators now allow that this coming of the Lord through the closed doors was miraculous. Thus Meyer: "The constitution of His Body changed, brought nearer to the glorified state, although not immaterial, is the condition for such a liberation of the Risen One from the limitations of space that apply to ordinary corporeity." Thus Godet: "... The natural sense is, that the doors were and remained closed, and that Jesus appeared rather than entered. In truth, the body of Jesus ... was still more assimilated to the nature of the spiritual or glorified body. Now the characteristic of the latter is its being subject to the free disposition of the spirit." Thus Professor Westcott: "All that is set before us is, that He was not bound by the present conditions of material existence which we observe." Thus Professor Milligan, in the "Popular Commentary:" "Jesus, in His glorified humanity, had the power of being present when He pleased without reference to the ordinary laws which control the movements of men." Both Augustine and Chrysostom regard the entrance as miraculous: the former says: "To the substance of a Body in which was Godhead, closed doors were no obstacle." It is, as I said, satisfactory to note this, because in the beginning of the century we have so pious and evangelical a commentator as Thomas Scott, following a semi-Rationalist expositor, Whitby, in asserting that the Lord, unknown to the Apostles, opened the doors. The desire of the followers of Calvin to deny any supernatural attributes in the Lord's Risen Body, such as would raise it above the limitations and conditions of ordinary fleshly bodies, arises, of course, from their apprehension lest such supernatural attributes tell in favour

Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace *be* unto you.

20 And when he had so said, he shewed unto them *his*
[p] ch. xvi. 22. hands and his side. [p] Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord.

---

of the Eucharistic Presence, but in their anxiety to oppose any such objective Presence they run the risk of denying that there can be such a thing as a spiritual body; for there is no sense in the term "spiritual" body, unless it describes a frame raised above the conditions of ordinary flesh and blood.

This place, apart from its Eucharistic significance, is of infinite value as setting forth the powers of the Resurrection or Spiritual Body. It will be so assimilated to spiritual existence that wherever the spirit within wills to move, it will move.

Note that it is expressly said that the Lord *came*. It was not that He suddenly stood in the midst, but that He *came* and stood in the midst, passing through space as well as through all obstacles.

"And saith unto them, Peace be unto you." This salutation is their absolution. They all had deserted Him. One had denied Him. Only one stood under the cross. And yet His first words to them, as assembled in a body, were, "Peace be unto you." When men remind us that this is the usual Eastern salutation they forget that no words can be unreal or conventional in the mouth of the Lord. If He speaks peace, there is peace.

20. "And when he had so said, he shewed unto them his hands and his side." We must insert between verses 19 and 20, the account in St. Luke xxiv. 36-43. As the coming through the closed doors evinced the spiritual and glorified condition of the Lord's Body; so the showing of the hands and feet, and permitting the disciples to feel and handle Him, showed that He was the same Jesus in body as well as in spirit. He had risen in the same Body in which He had been Crucified. He was the same, and yet a marvellous change had passed upon Him. At first, as we learn from St. Luke, they could trust neither hands nor eyes, "They believed not for joy, and wondered." But very quickly they ceased to fear and to doubt the evidence of their senses, for St. John tells us, "Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord."

The reader cannot but remember His words, "Ye now therefore

21 Then said Jesus to them again, Peace *be* unto you:

---

have sorrow, but I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you" (xvi. 22.)

21. "Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you." What is the significance of the second salutation of peace? St. Augustine considers it given simply to reassure them. But must we not rather look upon it as having reference to that fulness of the Apostolic Commission which He was just on the point of imparting to them? Thus, as Stier says, "The first peace was rather for the disciples themselves, to assure them and gladden their hearts, whilst the second peace was through them to pass on to all others."

"As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you." The powers assumed by the Apostles, and recognized by God, show that these words are to be taken in the fullest possible sense. The Father sent the Son to teach His doctrine (vii. 16), to gather out a flock, to pasture and feed that flock, and to give the Holy Ghost, and we find that the Apostles, as representing Christ, did all these things. As the Father instructed the Son as to what He was to teach (xii. 49), so the Son instructed the Apostles what they were to teach (xvii. 8). As the Father sent Him as Pastor of the Flock to admit men into it, and to feed them in it, and keep them in it, so the Son sent the Apostles as pastors and teachers to do the same (xxi. 15, 16, 17). But the office of a perfect pastor in the flock of Christ implies binding and loosing in some shape or other, because it has to do with the bringing back and restoration of those who have gone astray. Now if there was one thing which we should have thought that the Lord would have reserved entirely to Himself, and withheld from mere men, it was the giving of the Holy Ghost, and yet we are very distinctly told that through the Apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given. (Acts viii. 15, 18; xix. 6; 2 Tim. i. 6.)

But there is one thing in which the parallel between the Lord's own commission and that of His Apostles seems not to hold good. God sent His Son to die an atoning and reconciling Death, and the Lord certainly did not send His Apostles to die for sin.

But supposing that the Lord, instead of ascending up to heaven, had continued to dwell on the earth, how would He have forgiven sin? would He have repeatedly offered Himself up to God afresh?

q Matt. xxviii. 18. ch. xvii. 18, 19. 2 Tim. ii. 2. Heb. iii. 1.

q as *my* Father hath sent me, even so send I you.

No. He would have forgiven men by the application of His past atoning Death. And that is precisely what He commissioned His Apostles to do. They were to apply, to communicate the benefit of, to make men partakers of, the one all-sufficient Sacrifice.

This disposes of the question, Did the Lord send them as priests? God sent Him as a Priest. Did He, in His turn, send them as priests? If to be priests meant that they should atone for sins by offering some independent sacrifice, then, of course, they were not priests, and He did not send them as such; but if the essence of all Christian priesthood is the application to individuals of the one all sufficient Sacrifice, then He sent them to be priests to apply and to plead the same Sacrifice which He would have applied and pleaded if He had continued to minister upon earth.

Another question respecting these words is, To whom were they said? Were they spoken to the Apostles alone, so that this commission expired with the death of the last surviving one, or were they said to the Apostles as then containing in themselves the entire Christian ministry, or, as some suppose, to the Apostles conjointly with others (whose presence is mentioned by St. Luke only), these other persons receiving the commission on behalf of the laity co-ordinately with the Apostles? They were certainly intended for the Apostles alone, though as representing and containing in themselves the Christian episcopate and priesthood, for respecting the Apostles alone Christ had before said these very words, "As thou hast sent me into the world, so have I sent them into the world." And that this was a gathering of the Apostles as distinguished from the general body of believers is manifest from the fact that the absence of one, as one of the twelve, is particularly noticed. "Thomas, one of the twelve, was not with them." If it had been a general meeting of believers, I do not see how the absence of Thomas (by no means a leader among the twelve) would have been observed. Certainly, in the eyes of St. John, no others were present to receive, as is supposed, a commission on behalf of the non-ministerial part of the Church; for St. John, who alone gives us this Apostolic commission, mentions the presence of the Apostles only, and

22 And when he had said this, he breathed on *them*, and

notices the absence of one of the twelve. It was certainly then in his mind to confine this Mission to the Apostolic company, and in thus confining it he is in accord with all the intimations of the Mind of Christ, Who had chosen these twelve out of the number of the rest of the believers to be specially near to Himself, and to receive both instruction and promises which He did not vouchsafe to those who were not of the Apostolic company:[1] and it is also in accordance with the Mind of the Spirit, as that Mind is set forth in the Acts of the Apostles, for in that book a very unique position is assigned to the twelve.[2]

The commission then was given to the Apostles as distinct from the general body of believers. It was given in accordance with that counsel and decree of God by which He made the ministry of the Church to spring from a very small number of men rather than from a very large number. This commission, as well as all the commissions, was given to the Apostles as representing and containing in themselves the ministry which was to spring from them, which was to last to the end of time, for the Apostolic commission had to do, not with what was temporary, but with what was to last as long as the present state of things lasts: it had to do with the remission of sin, and the imparting of grace, and sin and grace will run side by side till the Second Coming.

22. "And when he had said this, he breathed on them," &c. This act was sacramental. His Breath was the outward visible sign betokening the proceeding of the Spirit from Him upon them. What was the relation of this gift of the Spirit to that at Pentecost? On the day of Pentecost the Spirit of God descended in all His fulness, but the sign which the Lord now gave could not be empty. It must have there and then conveyed the gift, or He would not have added to such a significant act as breathing, the words, "Receive ye."

[1] Thus, Luke vi. 13, "He called unto him his disciples: and of them he chose twelve, whom also he named apostles." John vi. 70, "Have not I chosen you twelve?" Matth. xix. 28, "Ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones," &c. xxvi. 20, "He sat down with the twelve." xxvi. 47, "Judas, one of the twelve."

[2] Thus Acts i. 24-26; ii. 14, 42; iv. 33, 35, 37; v. 12, 13.

saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost:

r Matt. xvi. 19. & xviii. 18.

23 r Whose soever sins ye remit, they are re-

---

22. Some commentators notice the omission of the article, "Receive ye [the] Holy Spirit." So Godet, "The natural meaning of the words of Jesus is: 'Receive an effusion of the Spirit'—but what is an effusion of the Spirit but the pouring of the Spirit into a man? The Spirit being an omnipresent and all-penetrating Person in the Godhead, there can be no influence of the Spirit apart from the Spirit. There are greater or lesser gifts, but the same Spirit. 1 Cor. xii. 4."

The Spirit now given was for the Apostleship. Hitherto they had been, if one may so say, Apostles designate, because Christ was visibly present, and as He Himself worked on all occasions they had little to do in the way of representing Him, but now that He was on the eve of departure they were to supply the need of His visible Presence. So now He saith, "As my Father sent Me, so send I you," and He breathed on them, and saith, as it were, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost to fulfil your ministry, as those whom I send to act in My place." This breathing was their full ordination to the Apostolic Office, which is the first of the Gifts of the Spirit to man (1 Cor. xii. 28, Ephes. iv. 11). It appears, then, that by this "breathing" they received the grace of the Holy Spirit to perform all Apostolic duties and functions, such as ruling the Church, appointing and regulating its pastors, government, ordinances, and worship; and, as all the ministry was then contained in them, they received the full grace of the Christian ministry to be in time to come conveyed by them to those whom they ordained to any office or work, as each office required. The Pentecostal gift consisted rather of visible powers, such as the gift of tongues, working of miracles, &c., to enable them to exercise their ministry on the scale, and with the astonishing success, which we read of at the planting of the Church. This breathing, then, betokened a special gift to them as Apostles, whereas the Pentecostal gift was on them and the whole Church, to enable that Church to exhibit the miraculous powers and the fruits of holiness by which it began to subdue the world.

23. "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whose soever," &c. Here the Lord confers the power of binding and loosing which He had before promised (Matth. xvi. 19, xviii. 18), particularly extending it to the binding and loosing of sins. In these words we have the full scope and

mitted unto them; *and* whose soever *sins* ye retain, they are retained.

---

extent of the power of the ministry of reconciliation, that it even extends to the exercise of that mysterious power which He had Himself exercised, and which had called down upon Him the wrath of the Scribes and Pharisees, viz., the giving of Absolution. The principle of the ministry of reconciliation is this, that God is pleased to convey the benefits of redemption from sin, not only directly from Himself, but mediately, or more indirectly, but not the less certainly, through the action of others. It is allowed on all hands that He uses the instrumentality of men in conferring upon sinners the inestimable blessing of repentance or conversion through the ordinance of preaching; but in this and in several other passages we have power given to confer another benefit of redemption, the remission of sins by word of mouth, *i.e.*, by a sort of sentence judicially pronounced. Thus, St. Paul having heard of the repentance of a certain sinner, pronounces his absolution by ratifying the reception of him to Church Communion in the words, "To whom ye forgive anything, I forgive also; for if I forgave anything, what I forgave, for your sakes forgave I it in the person of Christ" (2 Cor. ii. 10).

We of the Church of England are, thank God, not left to toss on the waves of doubt and difficulty in the frail bark of private judgment, in the matter of the application of this tremendous passage. It is settled for us that the Lord here confers the commission of binding and loosing on the Christian ministry, as distinguished from the Christian society: for, in the use of these words, accompanied by the laying on of hands, each individual priest is admitted into the second order of the ministry. "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained," and the ministers thus ordained have a form given to them in the use of which they are to exercise this power for the benefit of those who humbly and heartily desire it. "Our Lord Jesus Christ, Who hath left power in His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great mercy forgive thee thine offences: And by His authority committed unto me, I absolve thee from all thy sins. In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

24 ¶ But Thomas, one of the twelve, [a] called Didymus was not with them when Jesus came.

[a] ch. xi. 16.

25 The other disciples therefore said unto him, We have seen the Lord. But he said unto them, Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe.

---

24. "But Thomas, one of the twelve, called Didymus, was not with them," &c. The meeting that evening, being one of the whole Apostolic body, all of whom were there except Thomas, it seems probable that there was something blameworthy in his absence. They could not have all assembled together, except by mutual agreement, or, perhaps, by Divine guidance; and this agreement or guidance he may have disregarded. He seems to have been of a moody, melancholy temper of mind, which would lead him to nurse his grief and bitter disappointment alone by himself. St. Bernard draws this lesson from his absence: "Even this may have a moral meaning, that he who is [wilfully] separate from the Apostolic body, is not visited by Christ's manifestations."

25. "The other disciples therefore said unto him . . . I will not believe." This answer seems exceedingly presumptuous; but we are to remember that he treated the testimony of his brother Apostles as they had treated the accounts of the women, which they had received as "idle tales." He demanded the proof of seeing the print of the nails, and the wound of the spear, and putting his finger into them, because of what the Apostles had told him respecting Jesus showing them His hands and His side. It is as if he said, "I will not believe *you*. I must have the same visible, tangible proof as you have had, ere I believe." It is to be remembered that St. Thomas may not for a moment have disbelieved that our Lord was the greatest of prophets, and the holiest of men, and that His glorified Spirit was high in the favour of God, and that It had, or would have, the highest place in the world of spirits; but what he refused to believe was that His Body had risen. In all probability, he believed that his brother Apostles had seen the Lord's Spirit, but not His Body; and so he demanded, not mere sight, but touch, which would prove the Body to be real.

26. "And after eight days again his disciples were within, and

26 ¶ And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them: *then* came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace *be* unto you.

27 Then saith he to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger and behold my hands; and [t]reach hither thy hand, and thrust *it* into my side: and be not faithless, but believing.

[t] 1 John i. 1.

28 And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God.

Thomas with them," &c. What is the significance of Thomas being now with them? Very great indeed. It is a proof that he had not forsaken, but yet adhered to, the Apostolic fellowship. He could not but believe that there had been some extraordinary manifestation of the Lord. They could not have all been deceived by a cerebration, or a subjective illusion; and so he felt how dangerous it was to separate himself from the special meetings of his brethren; and so the merciful Lord more than made up to him the loss.

27. "Then saith he to Thomas, Reach hither . . . be not faithless, but believing." Notice how our Lord here regards as faithlessness or unbelief a doubt of the reality of His Resurrection in the same Body in which He had suffered; and how He regards as "faith" or "belief" an acceptance of every revelation of Himself which He is pleased to make. We have noticed how this is the faith which is recognized and demanded all through this gospel. We have noticed how, when the Lord sets Himself forth as the Bread of Life, and asserts that Bread to be His Flesh, He requires belief in it (vi. 47, note): how, when He sets forth Himself as the Resurrection and the Life, He requires belief in that (xi. 26). And now, when He is setting forth His Resurrection in His real, but spiritualized and glorified body, He requires specific belief in that.

28. "And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God." How astonishing the sequence, the leap, the bound of faith here! The Lord manifests the reality of His Risen Body; and St. Thomas instantly makes, on the strength of it, the most absolute confession of His Highest Godhead—and on principles of common sense. For the evidence of the reality of the Lord's

29 Jesus saith unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen
[u] 2 Cor. v. 7. 1 Pet. i. 8. me, thou hast believed: [u] blessed *are* they that have not seen, and *yet* have believed.

---

29. All ancient authorities, almost without exception, omit "Thomas."

Resurrection was the direct evidence of the truth of all that He had said of Himself. He had said of Himself that God was His real Father; that, as God's true and proper Son, He so inherited the Divine Nature as to do what the Father did, to judge as the Father judged, to be One with the Father, to have had glory with the Father before the world was, to receive, now and hereafter, the same honour as the Father. Now, a devout Jew, such as St. Thomas was, believed that God alone could raise the dead, and that He certainly would not raise from the dead an impostor who claimed to be what he was not, much less a blasphemer, who claimed to participate in the Divine Nature, when he was a mere man; and so, being convinced of the Resurrection, he lost not a moment in confessing the true Godhead. Notice here how the doctrine of the Lord's Godhead was not developed, but was confessed in His own hearing before His Ascension by the one of all His followers the slowest to believe.

29. "Jesus saith unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast . . . yet have believed." If true and real belief or faith be the evidence, or firm conviction, of things not seen, then the virtue of faith is that it apprehends the unseen. Sight and touch force belief upon us; but belief in the unseen, in spite of our inability to see (and so, a belief above, and in a manner contrary to, the evidence of our senses), is the noblest faculty with which God has endowed man: for it is that faculty, and that alone, which evidences to a man the unseen and eternal God; and not only so, but puts him in connection with that God, enables him to apprehend God's holiness and goodness, and, together with the revelation of Jesus Christ (now also unseen by us), to realize His mercy and love towards us.

It is to be noticed that the benediction of the Lord makes the later generations of Christians more on an equality with those in the Apostolic times. They saw and believed; we, if we are faithful, have this advantage over them, in that we now walk more completely by

30 ¶ [x] And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book:

[x] ch. xxi. 25.

31 [y] But these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; [z] and that believing ye might have life through his name.

[y] Luke i. 4.

[z] ch. iii. 15, 16, & v. 24. 1 Pet. i. 8, 9.

---

faith, not by sight. Our faith may be the nobler, and win more favour from God.

30. "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which," &c. From the words, "in the presence of his disciples," we gather that these signs were not the miracles before the Crucifixion, done in the presence of the multitude, but the appearances after His Resurrection—as, for instance, that to the disciples on the way to Emmaus, and those mentioned by St. Paul as given to Cephas, to James, and to the five hundred.

31. "But these are written, that ye might believe . . . life through His Name." It seems at first sight strange that all the great things recorded by this Apostle should be simply that we should believe that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." But we must remember that to words or titles to which, in this unbelieving age, we attach the lowest significance, St John would attach the highest; so that by the title "Christ," St. John would designate One anointed with the fulness of the Spirit, so that He should perfectly represent God, and perfectly fulfil all those prophecies of a Divine Being ruling amongst men, which abound in the Old Testament; and by the title "Son of God," St. John would mean a real Son, begotten from all eternity, inheriting with the Divine Nature of His Father all His attributes and perfections, Who came to assure us that the God of all flesh is a true Father, because He Himself is His true and only Son.

"And that believing ye might have life through His Name." The believing is a means to an end, and that end is our having "life through His Name." By Life, St. John means the Resurrection Life of Christ to be the source of a new Life in our whole nature of body, soul, and spirit. The significance of the appearance of a Risen Christ is twofold—it assures us that He is that Son of God, which He claimed to be, and that He is now in a condition to impart to us that Life from Himself which He promised.

CHAP. XXI.

AFTER these things Jesus shewed himself again to the disciples at the sea of Tiberias; and on this wise shewed he *himself*.

2 There were together Simon Peter, and Thomas called [a] Didymus, and [a] Nathanael of Cana in Galilee, and [b] the *sons* of Zebedee, and two other of his disciples.

[a] ch. i. 45.
[b] Matt. iv. 21.

---

1. "Showed;" rather, manifested. So Alford and Revisers. Vulg., *manifestavit.*

1. "After these things Jesus shewed himself again to the disciples," &c. After these things, that is, after what had taken place on the Sunday of the Resurrection, and on the octave of that Sunday. The indication of time is so indefinite that it is impossible to say when during the great forty days the appearance of the Lord now about to be related occurred. Very probably soon after the second appearance to the assembled disciples just related. According to the Lord's express command, they would go to Galilee, and when there, inasmuch as they had no means of subsistence, would betake themselves to their former means of livelihood. It is certain that the appearance by the lake was prior to the appearance at the "mountain where Jesus had appointed them." Some think that it took place on the morning of the second Sunday after Easter, as they seem to have set out on the previous evening. If so the whole of the appearances to this time would have taken place on the Lord's Day.

"Showed," rather "manifested" Himself, the word betokening more of a supernatural revelation than "showed."

2. "There were together Simon Peter," &c. Simon Peter here, and throughout, takes the lead: the rest are Thomas, who appears anxious to keep with the heads of the Apostolic company; Nathanael, in all probability Bartholomew, and two others supposed to be Andrew and Philip, as both had their homes on the lake. But, as their names are not mentioned, it is possible that the two last may not have been of the number of the Twelve.

3 Simon Peter saith unto them, I go a fishing. They say unto him, We also go with thee. They went forth, and entered into a ship immediately; and that night they caught nothing.

4 But when the morning was now come, Jesus stood on the shore: but the disciples [c] knew not that it was Jesus.

5 Then [d] Jesus saith unto them, || Children, have ye any meat? They answered him, No.

6 And he said unto them, [e] Cast the net on the right side of the ship, and ye shall find. They

[c] ch. xx. 14.
[d] Luke xxiv. 41.
|| Or, *Sirs.*
[e] Luke v. 4, 6, 7.

---

3. "Immediately" omitted by ℵ, B., C., D., L., Vulgate, old Latin, and versions; retained by A., later Uncials, and almost all Cursives.

3. "Simon Peter saith unto them, I go a fishing." This does not, of course, mean that He intended to return to his old occupation; but, like St. Paul, he had worked at a trade and endeavoured to support himself by it when there was need. (Acts xviii. 3; xx. 34; 1 Cor. iv. 12.)

"They say unto him, We also go with thee." It is probable from this that all the seven lived on the shore, and were either fishermen by trade, or were accustomed to take part in it, for the presence of others who could render no assistance would have been a hindrance in the boat.

4. "But when the morning was now come . . . . knew not that it was Jesus." The remark, "it was morning," seems made to show that it was not because of the twilight that they did not recognize the Lord, but because their eyes were holden. All the appearances of the Risen Lord were supernatural, and depended on His own Will. So with men's recognition of Him. At times He was invisible, at times He was visible and not recognizable, and not till He willed it did men know Him.

5. "Then Jesus saith unto them, Children, have ye any meat?" "Children." In the margin it is "Sirs." In the notes by F. M. it is suggested that it should be "lads."

"Have ye any meat?" Something to eat with food to give it a relish. Here it is a name for "fish."

6. "And he said unto them, Cast the net on the right side of the ship," &c. No doubt He commanded them to do something

cast therefore, and now they were not able to draw it for the multitude of fishes.

[f] ch. xiii. 23. & xx. 2.

7 Therefore [f] that disciple whom Jesus loved saith unto Peter, It is the Lord. Now when Simon Peter heard that it was the Lord, he girt *his* fisher's

---

unusual. They were, apparently, better able to see what fish there were about the ship than He could have been, but they felt that there was something in the command which gave them confidence that He could assist them, and so, having as yet been unsuccessful, they obeyed Him.

"They cast therefore, and now they were not able to draw it," &c, The whole account is so full of mystical and spiritual lessons that it will be best to draw attention to them as we proceed.

Just then, as on the occasion of the former miracle (Luke v. 1-12), they had "toiled all night and taken nothing," so it was now. Just as then they let down the net at the express command of the Lord, so now. Just as then they enclosed a great multitude of fishes, so now. Thus was it twice in the Sea of Galilee, and so it is at the present in the sea of human souls. The fishers of men toil and take nothing: and yet it is their duty to toil on, even through darkness, and disappointment, and weariness; but sooner or later, perhaps when they least expect it, the reward will come. Even though it come not in their own lifetime, their toil will not have been in vain, even in the matter of their own joy of reward: they will in the unseen or future world, know of the success which has followed their labours. It will be with the fishers of souls as with the sowers of the good seed: as one soweth and another reapeth, and both rejoice together (iv. 36), so one will toil and another drag the multitudes of fish to shore; but at the last each man will "receive his own reward according to his own labour."

7. "Therefore that disciple whom Jesus loved saith . . . . It is the Lord." St. John first recognized Him, because his memory was the quickest to recall the former sign on the same lake. A stranger on the shore had bid them cast in the net again, the miraculous sweep followed close on, the weight of the net proved what a haul they had secured, and so the loving Apostle exclaimed, "It is the Lord." It is not to be supposed for a moment that St. John recognized the Lord by gazing towards the shore. But though

coat *unto him* (for he was naked,) and did cast himself into the sea.

8 And the other disciples came in a little ship; (for they were not far from land, but as it were two hundred cubits,) dragging the net with fishes.

9 As soon then as they were come to land, they saw a fire of coals there, and fish laid thereon, and bread.

10 Jesus saith unto them, Bring of the fish which ye have now caught.

---

8. "In a little ship;" rather, "in the boat;" Vulg., *navigium.*

the first in discovering, he was not the first in action. As Chrysostom remarks, "The disciples, Peter and John, again exhibit the peculiarities of their respective tempers. The one was more fervent, the other more lofty; the one more keen, the other more clear-sighted. On this account John first recognized Jesus, Peter first came to Him." And is not this acted over again in all ages of the Church? The contemplative discover the truth, the energetic act upon it. The reader will remember how in the preceding chapter, St. John is said to have "stooped and seen the linen clothes lie, but went he not in," so here he is the first to recognize the Lord, but St. Peter is the first to fall down at His feet.

"He girt his fisher's coat unto him, for he was naked." Theophylact says, "it was a linen cloak which the Phœnician and Tyrian fishermen wore, wrapping it around them when they were naked, or putting it over their other garments."

8. "And the other disciples came in a little ship," rather in the boat. The authorized version leaves it uncertain whether it was the same in which they had been all the night fishing.

"As it were two hundred cubits," &c., *i.e.*, about one hundred yards. Within so short a distance they could easily have recognized the Lord at the first if it had been His Will.

"Dragging the net with fishes." Instead of, as before, lifting it with its contents into the ship, they dragged it to shore.

9, 10. "As soon then as they were come to land . . . which ye have now caught." This fire of coals, *i.e.*, charcoal fire, with the fish on it, was there by the Divine power of Christ, whether prepared by angel hands, or by His own creative powers, it matters not, as in either case the supply was supernatural. The significance

11 Simon Peter went up, and drew the net to land full of great fishes, an hundred and fifty and three: and for all there were so many, yet was not the net broken.

---

of it seems to be something of this sort: they had been toiling for food all night, and at the last received an abundant recompense; but instead of waiting for this to be prepared, the Lord had already provided a meal to which some of the fish which they had caught was to be added. The fruit of their own labours was to be joined to that which the Lord had provided on the shore. Thus in all their future labours Christ will give them that on which they have bestowed no labour, and yet to this will be added the fruits of their own toil, and yet even this will be the outcome of Christ's power rather than of their own endeavours. Some, however, suppose that the Lord commanded them to bring of the fish which had been caught, not that it should be baked and eaten, but that it should not be lost, and that it should be counted, and in this case the meat consisted solely of what He had provided.

11. "Simon Peter went up, and drew the net to land." It is not to be supposed that he did this by himself unaided, but that he left the side of the Lord, and waded up to the boat to his companions, and being in the shallow water, he would be able to do what, whilst they were in the boat, they could not do, *i.e.*, land both the net and the boat together.

"An hundred and fifty and three." It must have been by the Lord's direction that, at such a time, when they were full of awe at His presence, they numbered the fish.

"And for all there were so many, yet was not the net broken." We cannot help noticing that, in his account of this miracle, the Apostle must have had in his mind not only the miracle of the miraculous draught in Luke v., but also the parable of the sagene or draw-net of Matthew xiii. For he notices that the Lord stood and bade them cast their net on a particular side of the ship, that when the draught of fishes was enclosed in the net it was not hauled into the ship, but eventually dragged to the shore; that the fishes taken in the first haul were a great multitude of fishes, so that the net brake, but that in this miracle there were one hundred and fifty-three, and the net was not broken. Then in the parable of the draw-net, when the net was drawn to shore, there was a separation

12 Jesus saith unto them, [g] Come *and* dine. And none of the disciples durst ask him, Who art thou? knowing that it was the Lord.

[g] Acts x. 41.

---

12. "Come and dine." See below.

made between those worth preserving and those not, whereas in this case all that are caught are large ones, and none are thrown away.

It is not difficult to see what the spiritual significance is. The net let down at the command of Christ on the right side is the work of the Church in preaching, or other ordinances, which is effectual to the salvation of the true elect of God, as contrasted with that general work which gathered into the ship of all sorts—a great mixed body containing good and bad. The net broken by the multitude of fishes is the Church injured in her usefulness and her witness to Christ, and her power over her members by the "mixed multitude" enclosed in her meshes, whereas the unbroken net is the perfect action of the Church in spite of all hindrance in the sight of man in saving, and disciplining the true elect, and landing them all safe on the eternal shore. The definite number of the fish caught is the "number of the elect"—one hundred and forty-four thousand, now known only to God and Christ ["I know my sheep"], but hereafter to be known to all men. The dragging to the shore of the true elect seems to be the first Resurrection, in which the blessed and holy ones only have part.

Augustine and others elicit very many other mystical meanings from the account, but many of these are very fanciful, as particularly the spiritual significance of the number 153.

12. "Jesus saith unto them, Come and dine;" rather, "Come and break your fast," "Come and take your first meal."

"And none of the disciples durst ask him, Who art thou?" Thus Chrysostom: "For they no longer had the same boldness, nor were they so confident, nor did they now approach Him with speech; but with silence, and great fear, and reverence sat down, giving heed to Him."

"Knowing that it was the Lord." "I take these words to imply that they sat down to the meal in silence—wondering at, while at the same time they well knew, Him Who was thus their host" (Alford). The account here seems to point to some considerable

13 Jesus then cometh, and taketh bread, and giveth them, and fish likewise.

14 This is now [h] the third time that Jesus shewed himself to his disciples, after that he was risen from the dead.

[h] See ch. xx. 19, 26.

15 ¶ So when they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter,

---

difference in the personal appearance and manner of the Lord, so that they should be conscious Who He was, and yet not recognize Him as before. Chrysostom supposes that they desired to ask respecting this alteration: "Seeing that His form was altered, and full of much awfulness, they were greatly amazed, and desired to ask concerning It; but fear and their knowledge that He was not some other, but the same, checked the inquiry."

13. "Jesus then cometh, and taketh bread," &c. This seems to have been intended to bring to their minds the feeding of the five thousand with similar food, only here He feeds them with the same food miraculously produced, with which they then fed the multitudes. What is the significance of this, but that the ministers of Christ, to whom He commits the feeding of His flock, must first be themselves fed, and by His own hands, with the same nourishment with which they will have to feed others?

14. "This is now the third time . . . . risen from the dead." The third appearance, that is, to the Apostles, or, as they are usually called throughout this Gospel, the disciples. It was the sixth or seventh, if we reckon among them one to Mary Magdalen, one to the other women, one to the disciples on the way to Emmaus, and one to St. Peter alone. This reference to the order of His appearances is important for two reasons: it is certainly a tacit correction of the narratives in Matthew and Mark, for from these we should suppose that the Lord's first appearance to the Apostles was in Galilee; and, in the second place, it emphasizes the importance of appearances to the Apostolic body. The two former appearances were to the Apostles, and if others had been present at the two former meetings it was, as it were, accidentally. They were certainly not present to receive any commission.

15. "So when they had dined [or breakfasted], Jesus saith to Simon Peter," &c. It is to be remarked at the outset that the whole narrative which follows is of a personal nature, and is, in this

Simon, *son* of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these? He

15. "Son of Jonas." "Son of John," ℵ, B., C., D., L., old Latin, Vulg. "Jonas" with A., later Uncials, all Cursives and versions.

respect, in decided contrast to the appearance to the ten, which was, so to speak, official. There the Lord says nothing of their personal feelings towards Him, but breathes on them as a body, and says to them, "As my Father sent Me, so send I you," and gives them the power of remitting and retaining sins. Here, on the contrary, we have the personal individual restoration of one who had thrice fallen. He had thrice publicly denied His Master. The Lord had since then appeared to him privately, and, no doubt, reassured him of His forgiveness and love. He had appeared to him also when in company with the ten, and he had then received along with them the blessing of peace, as well as the commission which they jointly received; but inasmuch as he had thrice fallen, and by each fall had evinced the imperfection of that love and devotion which he had before so loudly professed, it was needful in the eyes of the Lord, that, in the presence of his brethren, he should be personally restored and reassured. For the ministry of every minister of Christ has, as it were, two sides—an official side, which must be in many respects independent of his personal feelings and character, for whatever be the inner state of his heart, he must preach, he must teach, he must baptize, he must celebrate the Eucharist; but if his ministry is to be worth anything, if it is to be something more than mechanical routine, it must be rooted in his own personal faith and love.

Now it is this personal side of his ministry with which this thrice-repeated charge to work the work of a pastor, has to do. After three such denials his fellow Apostles might doubt whether he could even be an effective Apostle, much less take the lead among them, which he had done before. After three such falls, he might himself enter on the work of the Apostolate with doubts and misgivings which would be fatal to the success of his ministry. In the incident which succeeds we have such doubts, either on the part of others, or of himself, for ever removed. Others were to look upon him, he was to look upon himself as completely reinstated in his ministry as if he had never fallen.

After these necessary observations we proceed to the narrative.

15. "So when they had dined [breakfasted] . . . . . Feed my

saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my lambs.

16 He saith unto him again the second time, Simon, *son* of Jonas, lovest thou me? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my sheep.

[t] Acts xx. 28. Heb. xiii. 20. 1 Pet. ii. 25. & v 2, 4.

16. "Feed my sheep." B., C. read, προβάτιά, "little sheep;" but ℵ, A., D., later Uncials, old Latin (a, c, e, f), all Cursives read, "sheep," but Vulg. "lambs."

lambs." "Lovest thou me more than these?"—these, thy fellow-disciples. Why "more than these"? Evidently, because he had so foolishly compared himself with the other Apostles to his own advantage, when he said, "Though all should be offended, yet will I never be offended."

"Yea, Lord," he answers; "thou knowest that I love thee." Notice that he does not take up the Lord's words "more than these." He simply appeals to the Lord's intimate knowledge of hearts. "Thou knowest that I love thee." To this the Lord replies, "Feed my lambs." The first sign of love to Christ in the pastor is the care of the young, or of the feeble-minded, or of the new converts. All, in fact, that are not able to feed themselves. The word "feed" here is different from that in the next verse, and signifies simply "feeding," supplying with food; and not "tending" as well.

16. "He saith to him again the second time, Simon, ... Feed my sheep." As Peter had not in his answer compared his love with that of others, so now, in the second question, the Lord no longer hints at his former self-assertion.

"Feed my sheep," here is "tend," or "shepherd my sheep"—give them not only food, but all pastoral care and supervision.

Two manuscripts (see above) read "little sheep," and the Vulgate in both these verses reads "lambs."

In both these verses the Lord in His question used one word for "love," and St. Peter in his answer uses another, and, as scholars tell us, a word of inferior meaning. Godet expresses the difference thus: "For the term ἀγαπᾶν, to love, in the sense of veneration, complete, profound, eternal love, he substitutes the word φιλεῖν, to love, in the sense of cherishing friendship, simple personal attachment, devoted affection."

17 He saith unto him the third time, Simon, *son* of Jonas, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved, because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me? And he said unto him, Lord, [k] thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus saith unto Him, Feed my sheep.

[k] ch. ii. 24, 25. & xvi. 30.

---

17. "Feed my sheep." So ℵ, D., later Uncials, all Cursives, old Latin (a, b, c, d, e, f), and Vulg.; but A., B., C. read, "little sheep" [προβατιά], as in the preceding verse.

17. "He saith unto him the third time, Simon, ... feed my sheep." Here the Lord changes the higher word signifying love [αγαπᾷν] which he had used before for the lower one [φιλεῖν], which Peter had used in his answers. "Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time." The third repetition would remind him of his thrice-repeated denial. It also seemed to throw a doubt on his sincerity, and so he was grieved—naturally grieved, and he appealed to Christ as the omniscient Searcher of Hearts, "Lord, thou knowest all things." This is, in reality, as unreserved a confession of our Lord's true Godhead as was that of St. Thomas, "My Lord and my God," for God claims for Himself alone the prerogative of searching the heart: "I the Lord search the heart." "There is not a thought in my heart but thou, Lord, knowest it altogether."

"Feed my sheep." So that the Lord makes the care of His flock in feeding or leading it the one proof of love to Himself.

And now the question must be asked and answered, What is the flock which St. Peter is bid to feed or tend? The Romanist says, "The whole flock of Christ. The Church Catholic throughout the world is to be fed by him, and by his successors, the bishops of Rome, to the end of time." Now it makes very considerably in favour of this view, if this threefold charge is a restoration of St. Peter to his Apostleship; for in that case the commission on Easter Day, "As my Father sent me, so send I you" (which he received in common with the rest of the Apostles), goes for nothing, and here he has a special restoration, so worded that it seems to make him the one universal Pastor; but, if we take the words of xx. 21 as the restoration to the Apostolate, then he has already received his restoration jointly with the others, and now he receives his reassurance that the sin of his thrice-repeated fall is wiped away—

18 [1]Verily, verily, I say unto thee, When thou wast young, thou girdedst thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldest: but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry *thee* whither thou wouldest not.

[1] ch. xiii. 36. Acts xii. 3, 4.

---

and is to be as if it had never been, and from the root of his present love he is to work in the pastorate with all the confidence of one who had never fallen; nay, the very memory of his falls is to make him more lovingly restore, bind up, and reconcile fallen ones to God: so that, to adopt the words of his brother Apostle, he was to be "able to comfort those that were in any trouble by the comfort wherewith he himself was comforted of God." (2 Cor. i. 4.)

Such an universal pastorate as was claimed for him he neither claimed himself, nor attempted to exercise, nor was it ever ascribed to him; in fact, he disclaimed any such thing, when by joint agreement of the Apostles, the field of Apostolic oversight was divided, Paul and Barnabas taking the heathen, he, James, and John the Circumcision.[1] (Gal. ii. 8, 9.)

18. "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, When thou wast young, thou girdedst thyself," &c. "Thou girdedst thyself," *i.e.*, for active work. There may be a reference to the activity which St. Peter had just displayed in girding his fisher's coat around him. The Lord here may contrast the active obedience of his ripe manhood, easy to him because falling in with his natural temperament, with the passive submission of his old age in yielding to death.

"But when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands . . . . thou wouldest not." There seems to be here indicated a willingness to die for the sake of Christ, in "Thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee," and yet a natural shrinking from death in the Lord's words "shall carry thee whither thou wouldst not." So Chrysostom: "What then is the 'Whither thou willest not?' He speaketh of natural feeling and the necessity of the flesh, and that the soul is unwillingly torn from the body.

---

[1] The reader will see this question most exhaustively treated in Bishop Moberly's "Sayings of the Great Forty Days," Discourse III.

19 This spake he, signifying [m] by what death he should glorify God. And when he had spoken this, he saith unto him, Follow me.

[m] 2 Pet. i. 14.

20 Then Peter, turning about, seeth the disciple [n] whom Jesus loved following; which also leaned on his breast at supper, and said, Lord, which is he that betrayeth thee?

[n] ch. xiii. 23, 25, & xx. 2.

So that even though the will were firm, yet still even the nature would be found in fault. For no one lays aside the body without feeling. God, as I said before, having suitably ordained this, that violent deaths might not be many." St. Augustine also refers to the example of Christ in naturally shrinking from death: "For our consolation even the Saviour took the affection upon Himself, saying, 'Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass away from Me.'"

The "girding" here is not, as some suppose, girding in the act of crucifixion, but being manacled and bound so as to be led or borne to crucifixion. According to tradition, he was led out of Rome to be crucified with his head downwards.

19. "This spake he, signifying by what death he should glorify God." Glorifying God by death means, of course, martyrdom, as distinguished from natural death. The Apostle assumes that the circumstances of the martyrdom of St. Peter, about A.D. 64 or 65, were well known.

"And when he had spoken this, he saith unto him, Follow me." There is considerable difficulty as to what is meant by this command "Follow me." We should naturally explain it as meaning, "Follow Me in the path of obedience and suffering, even unto death." But the next verse seems to forbid this inference, for there we read,

20. "Then Peter, turning about, seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved following," &c. From this it is assumed by Godet and others that the Lord bid St. Peter follow Him to some little distance in order to speak to him alone: and that Peter, seeing John thus following unbidden, asked, "What shall this man do?" But this seems so unlikely that I should rather interpret the two words "follow" and "following" in different senses, and without reference to one another; the first following meaning "follow Me in the path of self-denial and love," and the second ("turning about, seeth

21 Peter seeing him saith to Jesus, Lord, and what *shall* this man *do?*

22 Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry [o] till I come, what *is that* to thee? follow thou me.

[o] Matt. xvi. 27, 28, & xxv. 31. 1 Cor. iv. 5. & xi. 26. Rev. ii. 25. & iii. 11. & xxii. 7, 20.

---

the disciple following"), as indicating that Jesus and the disciples moved from the place where they were, that Peter followed close after the Lord, and turning about saw St. John, and asked if the Lord would give him also a charge, or if the charge which he had received was meant also for St. John. The question of St. Peter is, "Lord, but this man, what of him?" as if it meant, "What word has Thou for him?" This does not seem to be said officiously, but out of his interest in St. John, the two being seemingly so attached to one another, and so much together. The reference in verse 20 is probably introduced to show that from the familiarity between these two disciples (it being at St. Peter's instance that St. John asked the question of the Lord respecting the traitor), St. Peter was more likely to inquire respecting the destiny of St. John.

22. "Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry . . . . follow thou me." It seems strange that there should have been any difficulty respecting the meaning of the Lord's answer. "Till I come," can only mean, "Till I come to judge the world." Some have interpreted it as meaning, "Till I come at the destruction of Jerusalem," which makes the Lord to mean, "If I will that he live forty years longer." Others seems to believe that the Lord rose up to go to some little distance, and meant, "If I will that he tarry till I come back." But the Lord evidently puts a very extreme case. "It is nothing to thee how I order the lives and deaths of thy brethren." This answer completely disposes of the dream of a perpetual governing of the Catholic Church, claimed on behalf of St. Peter and of his successors. If the Lord constituted St. Peter œcumenical Bishop, which rule he was to transmit to his successors, then such a matter as the perpetual existence of St. John till the Second Advent was of the utmost moment to him. If He constituted him Prince of the Apostles, then the Lord put all (including St. John) under St. Peter, and it was not only his right but his duty to inquire how the Lord would dispose of them. The Lord, then, here

23 Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should not die: yet Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die; but, If I will that he tarry till I come, what *is that* to thee?

24 This is the disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things: and [P] we know that his testimony is true.

[P] ch. xix. 35. 3 John 12.

---

23. ℵ alone of Uncials omits "What is that to thee?"

asserts the separate independence of each Apostle, and denies to St. Peter any right to *inquire* even into the way in which He intended to order their services.

23. "Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should," &c. The tradition that St. John should not die lingered till the time of Augustine. Thus he writes: "Of whom also [St. John] they have a tradition (which is found in some apocryphal writings) how he ordered a sepulchre to be made for him, being at the time in perfect health; and how when this had been dug, and most carefully prepared, he laid himself therein as in a bed, and straightway gave up the ghost; howbeit, as those suppose, who take these words of the Lord in this meaning, he did not actually die, but lay like one deceased; and being thought to be dead was buried asleep, and so remains until Christ come, giving tokens the while of his being alive by the heaving of the dust; which dust is supposed to be stirred by the breathing of the sleeper;" and he concludes, "I think it superfluous to combat this opinion."

It may be that the Lord, as he prophesied of the violent death of the one servant, so he foretold, or rather forecast, or foreshadowed, the long, painful, weary lingering whereby the other also glorified God. "St. Peter's was the martyrdom of death, St. John's was the martyrdom of life." (Bishop Wordsworth.)

24. "This is the disciple which testifieth of these things . . . . testimony is true." To whom is this verse to be ascribed? Many think that it was written by the Ephesian elders: but how could they testify to the truth of what they had not seen, in such language as this? It is extremely improbable that there were then surviving Apostles or Apostolic men who could vouch for

25 [q] And there are also many other things which Jesus
q ch. xx. 30. did, the which, if they should be written every

---

25. This whole verse omitted by ℵ, but retained by A., B., C., D., E., G., H., K., M., &c., old Latin, Vulg., and, in fact, all other authorities. It is omitted by Tischendorf on the authority of ℵ (but somewhat doubtful). According to Westcott and Hort, verse 25 stands not only in all other extant MSS. and versions, but in a considerable series of Fathers, including Origen, Pamphilus, Eusebius, Cyril, &c.

the truth of what is recorded by the Evangelist, either in this chapter, or in any other of the accounts of the Lord's words and works of which we have the record in the previous chapters of this Gospel.

Is it not the habit of this Evangelist all through his Epistle to alternate between the "I" and the "we"? He begins with the first person plural, "That which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of Life, ... we have seen it and bear witness." Now none who might have been then in St. John's company had thus "handled of the Word of Life." But in the next chapter he changes to the first person singular, "These things write I unto you that ye sin not;" then again he returns to the "we;" "Hereby we do know;" then in the seventh verse he resumes the "I:" "I write no new commandment," and so throughout the second chapter. Throughout the remainder, *i.e.*, the third and fourth chapters, the "we" is used, but in the last chapter (verse 13) he again returns to "I:" "These things have I written unto you." So that the Apostle thus speaking of himself as solemnly avouching for the truth of what he says, is only in accordance with his manner and habit, and that any persons should witness to the veracity of such an one in the matter of things of which they could have no personal knowledge, is incredible.

25. "And there are also many other things . . . . could not contain the books that should be written." This is an hyperbole, but it is one which, if properly understood, and devoutly contemplated, would lead us to consider what a very small fragment we have of the Life of Christ, and how infinite in the number of its incidents that Life must have been. For if the events related in all the Gospels were put one after another, they would not fill one month of His three years' active ministry. Let us remember how many notices we have of His teaching and preaching, of which teaching

one, [r] I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written. Amen.

[r] Amos viii. 10.

---

and preaching not one word has come down to us. See, for instance, Matthew iv. 23, 24; ix. 35; xv. 29, 30; xvi. 21; xix. 2. If the reader will take the trouble to refer to these places in one Gospel only, he will find that all of them imply days, in some cases weeks, of ministerial industry crowded with performances of miracles, and teachings, and preachings, and other incidents. Who can say what the record of the hours of a single day of our Lord's life would extend to if everything that could interest, everything that could edify, everything that we should admire or wonder at in an ordinary man were put down? So that this is a fitting figure with which to conclude the Gospel narrative, to impress upon us how infinitely full, and varied, and crowded with holy deeds was the human Life of the Word made flesh.

EXCURSUS I.

ON THE READING, "GOD ONLY BEGOTTEN," IN JOHN I. 18.

The reading, "God only begotten" (*μονογενὴς Θεὸς*, without definite article), is found in the MSS. of what is called by Westcott and Hort the Neutral text—*i.e.*, it is found in B., ℵ, C.*, and L., and of Cursives only in 33. It is found in the Peshito Syriac, and in the Harclean in margin (but not in the Cureton Syriac), and in the Coptic and Æthiopic.

The earliest Patristic evidence is somewhat as follows:—

Taking into account the strangeness of the collocation, God, the self-existent nature, being joined with "begotten," a word implying coming into existence, or deriving existence, it was very probably known to Justin Martyr, who writes: "The Word of Wisdom, Who is Himself this God, begotten of the Father of all things." (Trypho. 61.) Justin would scarcely have invented the phrase; and it is not likely that he would use in conjunction two words—one implying eternal existence, the other coming into existence—without authority; and the only authority we know of is this place.

Irenæus, in his book on Heresies, quotes the verse three times—twice as only begotten Son (III. chap. xi. sec. 6, and IV. chap. xx. sec. 6), once as only begotten God, as follows: "But His Word, as He Himself willed it, and for the benefit of those who beheld, did show His Father's brightness, and explained His purposes; as also the Lord said, 'The only begotten God, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him'" (IV. chap. xx. sec. 11). Harvey supposes that the MS. of Irenæus read "only begotten God;" and that, in the other places, the Latin translation had been conformed to the Old Latin or Vulgate, which reads "only begotten Son."

Clement of Alexandria: "And John the Apostle says, 'No man hath seen God at any time. The only begotten God, Who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him'—calling invisibility and ineffableness the bosom of God" (Miscell. V. chap. xii.). Clement also quotes the heretic Theodotus, "plainly calling Him God. The only begotten God, Who is," &c. Origen also quotes the verse, as having the word "God."

So that the reading of some of the MSS. used by Irenæus and Origen is "God only begotten," and of some "only begotten Son." The reading "God," then, seems to be exceedingly ancient. On the contrary, it seems to have been almost universally rejected by the Church; "only begotten Son" being found in A.; all later Uncials, except L.; all the Cursives, except 33; all the Old Latin (a, b, c, e, f, &c.); the Vulgate, Armenian, Æthiopic (Platt), and Cureton Syriac.

Amongst later Fathers, "God" is read by Epiphanius, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, and Cyril of Alexandria; but "Son" is read by Hippolytus, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, &c. For the places in these Fathers, the reader is referred to Tischendorf (8th edition), and Tregelles' "New Testament," on this passage.

That such a reading, having such authority, should have disappeared from all the later Uncials and Cursives, should not have been adopted by Jerome, to whom it must have been known, and not used by Athanasius (who died, 372 A.D.), though read by Cyril of Alexandria, long after his time (he died A.D. 440), is very perplexing, and shows, I think, that it is quite plain that we have not yet the materials for ascertaining the history of that text of the New Testament which, some time in the fourth century, superseded all others in the use of the Catholic Church.

EXCURSUS II.

ON THE RELATION OF OUR LORD'S WORDS IN JOHN III. 5 TO THE REGENERATION OF INFANTS IN BAPTISM.

Many who believe that the Baptism of Infants is according to the mind of Christ, and so continue the practice, are yet of opinion that our Lord, in His words to Nicodemus (John iii. 5), had in view the baptism of those of riper years only. But if so, the Catholic Church, in all its branches (and more especially the Church of England, as is proved by the first address in her office for the Baptism of Infants) has applied the teaching of this passage to the baptism of those for whom Christ did not intend it; and this is a very serious matter, when we consider that from very early times the practice of baptizing infants has been the rule, and the baptizing of those able to answer for themselves, the exception.

Our view of this matter will, of necessity, depend upon the view we take of the meaning and intention of these words of Christ. If we believe them to be intended to impress upon Nicodemus as a worldly and unconverted man the need of personal or spiritual religion, they will, of course, seem to us out of place when applied to infants, who cannot be pronounced regenerate if regeneration,—that is, a new birth of water and of the Spirit—be any form of conscious repentance or faith.

If, on the contrary, we believe with the Church that Christ meant by these words to set forth the mode of entrance into His *kingdom*, which kingdom is a kingdom of grace proceeding from Him as the Second Adam, answering to and designed to take the place of the kingdom of sin and evil we have been brought into by our union with the first Adam at our natural birth, then infants, as we shall see, are the fittest recipients of such grace as our Lord here alludes to. For, as has been well said, "Regeneration is the correlative and opposite of original sin. So the Catholic Church has ever taught, arguing by contraries from the one to the other: for example, as original sin is the transmission of a quality of evil (from Adam); so regeneration is the transfusion of a quality of good (from Christ); as original sin is inherited without the personal act of us who

are born of the flesh, so regeneration is bestowed without personal act or merit on infants who are brought to the font: as in the inheritance of original sin we are passive and unconscious, so in regeneration; as original sin precedes all actings of our will, so also may regeneration."

The analogy of the two Adams not only removes all difficulties out of the way of our believing the Baptismal Regeneration of Infants, but makes some such doctrine, if it be lawful to say so, necessary. For all men's doubts respecting the regeneration of infants in Baptism arise from the difficulty of supposing that the entrance into the Church of God as a spiritual kingdom can be granted to those who, owing to their tender years, cannot exercise repentance and faith; but they who are influenced by this objection forget that all men, without exception, enter into a state or kingdom of spiritual evil whilst they are in a state of unconsciousness, for whilst unable to exercise either faith or unbelief, all men are born into the first Adam, and so into a state of sin and death. Now, if Christ be the Second Adam, it seems only natural and fitting that He should, as the Second Adam, be the counterpart to the first Adam in the matter of the communication of grace from Himself—indeed of His own Nature, to those who are in a state of infancy, seeing that all such have, in a like state of infantile unconsciousness, received evil with the nature of the first Adam.

This seems still more likely if we take into account that He has redeemed every one of them by His one all-sufficient Sacrifice.

It seems fitting also that to those who partake of sin and evil by their *first* birth, He should communicate grace by that *second* birth of water and of the Spirit which He has ordained as the entrance into His kingdom.

Especially does this seem fitting when we remember that He says of little children, "of such is the kingdom of God."

Besides this, all His words respecting children, and His demeanour towards them, would lead us to infer that He accounts them to be equally as fit for receiving union with Himself as those who are able, from mature years, to exercise conscious faith, for to His own Apostles, who were consciously believing in and following Him, He declares that "they must become *as* little children before they can enter into His kingdom."

Many of those who practise infant Baptism are too apt to look upon it as if it were an abnormal thing, which God tolerates in this

dispensation of faith, but which is, after all, somewhat out of accord with the spirit of the dispensation, or as if it were a thing which His Church has adopted on her own suggestion, as it were, apart from the direct leading of the Spirit of God. But this is a great mistake; for though infant Baptism, with its attendant grace of union with the Second Adam, may appear exceptional when viewed in connection with that part of God's dealings by which God requires faith in those who are able to exercise faith, before He blesses them, yet it is the reverse of exceptional when viewed in connection with that part of God's dealings whereby He permits that unconscious infants should receive moral or spiritual evil from their earthly progenitor. When viewed in this light the Baptismal Regeneration of Infants is the natural and fitting counterpart in the kingdom of grace to the transmission of original sin in the kingdom of evil.

All this is recognized very clearly by such a Father as Augustine, who writes:—

"Therefore the Baptism of Infants is no more than is necessary: that they who by their generation are subject to that condemnation (*i.e.* of Adam) may, by regeneration, be freed from it. And as there is not a person in the world who is not carnally generated but from Adam, so neither is any spiritually regenerated but by Christ. The carnal generation is liable to that one offence, and the condemnation therof: but the spiritual regeneration takes away, not only that for which infants are baptized, but also those many [sins] which by wicked living men have added to that in which they are generated." ("Epistle to Hilarius," ed. Bened. vol. ii. page 711.) Again, "that poisonous serpent stung the whole mass of mankind in the first man. No one passes from the first man to the Second, except through the sacrament of Baptism. In children born and not yet baptized, let Adam be recognised; in children born and baptized, and on this account born again, let Christ be recognized." (Sermon on 1 Tim. 15, Benedictine edition, vol. vii. p. 834.)

"If you understand this aright, you would with simplicity and truth acknowledge the grace of Christ towards infants, and not be driven to say things so exceedingly impious and absurd, either that infants ought not to be baptized, or that so great a sacrament is in their case so utter a mockery, that they are baptized in a Saviour and not saved, redeemed by a Deliverer, but not delivered; washed in the laver of Regeneration, but not cleansed." ("Against Julian the Pelagian," iii. 11, Bened. ed. vol. xiii. p. 696).

"If the child live after Baptism, and come to an age capable of obeying God's commandments, then he has that concupiscence to fight against, and with God's help to conquer, if we have not received His grace in vain, and

if he resolve not to become a castaway." ("On the Guilt and Remission of Sin," i. 69, ed. Bened. vol. xiii. p. 47, 48.)

The same principle is acknowledged equally clearly by our own Jeremy Taylor; thus he writes:—

"The acts of Christ which were previous to the Institution of Baptism did prepare our understanding by such impresses as were sufficient to produce such persuasion in us, that Christ intended this ministry [of Baptism] for the actual advantage of infants as well as of persons of understanding. For Christ commanded that children should be brought unto Him, He took them up in His arms, He imposed hands on them and blessed them; and without question, did by such acts of favour consign His love to them. . . . . And it is all the reason in the world that since the grace of Christ is as large as the prevarication of Adam, all they who are made guilty by the first Adam, should be cleansed by the Second. But as they are guilty by another man's act, they should be brought to the font to be purified by others; there being the same proportion of reason that by others' act they should be relieved who were in danger of perishing by the act of others (*i.e.* the parents who brought them into being)." ("Liberty of Prophesying," vol. v. p. 541, Eden's edition.)

EXCURSUS III.

ON THE AUTHENTICITY OF JOHN V. 3, 4.

The last clause of verse 3, "waiting for the moving of the water," is omitted by ℵ, A., B., C., L., by Cursives 18, 157, 314, and Cureton Syriac, Coptic, and Memphitic. It is retained by D., later Uncials, most Cursives, old Latin, and Vulgate.

Verse 4 is omitted by ℵ, B., C., D., 33, 157, 134, and an unusual number of Cursives mark it with asterisks as doubtful. It is retained by A., E., F., G., H., I., K., L., M., by other late Uncials, by most Cursives, Old Lat. (a, b, c, e, ff², g,) Vulg. and Pesh. Syriac. Tertullian alone, of Ante-Nicene Fathers, quotes it: "Piscinam Bethsaidam angelus interveniens commovebat. observabant qui valetudinem quærebantur." ("De Bapt.") It is read by Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, and Augustine.

Very probably the words were a marginal note put in to account for the moving of the water, for the words of verse 7, "I have no

man, when the water is troubled, to put me into the pool," are in all MSS. It is quite certain from this that a moving of the water at uncertain times took place, and that it was supposed that the first person who was plunged in after this moving, and he only, was healed.

In considering this miracle in the notes, I have drawn attention to the fact that it is in no sense a miracle of the Lord's, and as far as I can see He in no shape or way recognized its reality, which I think He would have been careful to do if a messenger of His Father had actually descended, and by moving the water was the occasion of the healing.

It may be rejoined, If no angelic healing took place, ought He not to have disabused the people waiting there?

Now, if He had told the people that they were under a delusion respecting the cure, it is certain they would not have believed Him; but He showed them very plainly that His own presence and power made their waiting there quite unnecessary.

But, to me, the strongest reason against verse 4 is, that if the healing by the angel be true, it would be the one case in which God interfered in favour of the rich who had many friends to assist them into the pool, and passed by the poor and friendless. The fact that a periodical miracle of such a character is not mentioned by Josephus is not absolutely conclusive, but it has its weight.

The reader will forgive me if I quote an extract taking a view of the probability of this miracle which will be most likely new to him. It is from a very able treatise by a Romanist writer (the Rev. J. E. Bridgett) on "The Ritual of the New Testament," and has the imprimatur "✠ Henricus Eduardus, Archiep. Westmonast." The writer is answering an objection to the miracle as being unlike anything else recorded (which it is), and he remarks:

"If the miracle was not real, yet whence could the popular supposition of healing powers arise? It can only be attributed to its likelihood in the minds of the people of Jerusalem. If such a miracle were altogether unlike anything else recorded as happening in a great city like Jerusalem, how came the people of Jerusalem to expect it? The truth is, that it is only unlike anything that happens in Protestant London. You would not expect to find a multitude of poor cripples waiting for the stirring of the waters of the New River head in [near?] London, but you would not be at all astonished at finding a multitude of poor sick people at St. Winifred's Well in North Wales, or St. Bridget's Well in West Clare. The Catholic tradi-

tion of holy wells makes this history of St. John read very naturally to Catholics, the Protestant tradition against any such order of miracles makes it read very unnatural to Protestants." (P. 209.)

The worthy writer's illustration goes very far in accounting for the concourse, but not for the miracle.

EXCURSUS IV.

ON SOME QUESTIONS ARISING OUT OF THE WORDS OF THE LORD IN JOHN VI.

In ascertaining the relation of the Lord's words in John vi. respecting the partaking of His Flesh and Blood, to the Sacrament of His Body and Blood, one consideration, besides those which I have mentioned, must be taken into account, as it must necessarily have considerable weight in deciding the Eucharistic significance of the chapter. It is this: Certain words of this discourse are the most startling in the whole range of Scripture. If words have any meaning they betoken some very remarkable benefit indeed conferred upon the Christian. There is nothing in all Scripture which can be compared with "He that eateth My Flesh, and drinketh My Blood, dwelleth in Me and I in him." Now, they who have seen a sacramental reference in the terms "eating the Flesh of the Son of Man and drinking His Blood," have constantly used this sort of language when describing the close and intimate union subsisting between Christ and the Christian. And they who have seen no reference to the Holy Eucharist in the characteristic words of this chapter, but have explained them as expressing the inward realization of the Atonement, apart from any sacramental partaking, have, as a rule, when speaking of the union of Christians with their Lord, studiously avoided the use of the terms in question. Christians whose theology leads them to consider the Eucharist as *the* means of partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ, freely and naturally make use of the expressions in the discourse, and other Christians who evince the most undoubted love to their Redeemer, but whose prejudices lead them to disconnect, rather than otherwise, these words of Christ with the Eucharist, have avoided the use of the peculiar language of this chapter. They have used freely Scripture

expressions which betoken other aspects of Christ's love, as, for instance, His leading His people as a shepherd leads his flock, but not of His giving His Body and Blood as their spiritual food, so that the Lord's most startling and impressive words find no place in their practical or experimental theology. Thus they tacitly confess that the Eucharist is practically the only means by which the mystery of this chapter is brought within our reach.

(2.) A second question is this: Are we to be content with resting in faith on the words of the Lord respecting "eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood" as words which cannot be divested of their deep mystery, or are we through fear of their misapprehension in favour of Romanism, to attempt to express them in other words which are the clothing of more spiritual or intellectual ideas? The following are instances of this from the writings of divines of the Church of England:—"All that are saved, owe their salvation to the Salutary Passion of Christ; and their partaking thereof (which is feeding upon His Flesh and Blood), is their life." (Waterland.) "To eat the Flesh of Christ, is to realize in our inward life the mystery of His body now in heaven—to digest and assimilate our own portion in that Body. To drink His Blood is to realize in our inward life the mystery of His satisfaction for sin—to digest and assimilate our own portion in that satisfaction, the outpouring of that Blood." (Alford.) Or again: "It was now revealed [in this discourse] that life was to be gained by the personal appropriation of the virtues of Christ's Life and Death." (Westcott.) I have taken these extracts from writers who do not by any means deny an Eucharistic significance in this discourse. Moreover, these extracts set forth a necessary truth, that we must personally realize, each one of us for himself, our part in the Death and Passion of our Saviour Christ. But the question now is, Do they mean what the Lord meant when He spake about eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood? In considering this, let us remember that our Lord proceeds from that which is less to that which is more mysterious; from that which is capable, as He expresses it, of an intellectual apprehension, to that which, as He expresses it, is not capable of such intellectual apprehension. When the Lord says, "I am the Bread of Life," if we take these words by themselves, and proceed no further, it is evident that He sets Himself before us to be apprehended intellectually or spiritually. If we were asked how a person can be bread to us, so that

we should eat him, there seems to be but one answer—We eat him by contemplating or realizing his life, his example, his character, or his love to us. If he is a great teacher we might say that we feed on him by studying deeply his teaching, and if there were any peculiar circumstances in his death, as the patience he evinced in it, or the generous pouring forth of his life for us; then, by the grateful remembrance of this, we might be said to feed on such a death. But in these two latter cases we feed, not on the man himself, but on something connected with him. But the Lord does not stop with saying, "I am the living Bread." He proceeds to tell us how as the Bread of Life He is to be eaten. He gives Himself in His Flesh: "The Bread that I will give is my Flesh," "Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man," &c. Now, if *we* had to describe the way of eating Him as the bread of Life, we should never think of bringing in, or alluding to, His Flesh in any way. It would at once introduce confusion into a purely spiritual or intellectual process, for we feed on a person, or what belongs to a personality, in one way, and we feed on flesh in another. But the Lord does Himself introduce this disturbing element which we call the element of mystery, and we believe that He does it designedly, because He sees the deepest needs of our nature, and the only way in which these needs can be supplied. These needs require the reception of His lower nature before we can have union with His higher. If, then, we insist upon understanding His words in a more intellectual, or more spiritual or less mysterious way, we undo, as far as lies in our power, the purpose which He had in speaking of eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood rather than receiving any higher part of His nature.

And with respect to the difficulty of supposing that He could not then speak of the mystery of eating His Flesh to the Jews in the synagogue or to the weaker disciples who ceased to walk with Him let us suppose that our Lord meant by eating His Flesh some way of realizing His atoning Death. How could they, at that time, have any apprehension whatsoever of such an atoning Sacrifice? how could they in their then state believe that His Body before them could be by its violent Death some time after, the propitiation for all sin, and supersede and take the place of all their legal sacrifices? To form the smallest conception of how this could be brought about required that the Incarnation, the Death, and the Resurrection of this Man before them should be viewed in the full light of the Holy Spirit after the Ascension and the day of Pentecost. Not one of the

Twelve believed at that time that He could die as an all-sufficient Sacrifice, but what they did believe was that, having come from God, every word He said was to be received in unquestioning faith, whether they understood it or not. We desire, then, to receive the words of the Lord respecting the eating of His Flesh and drinking of His blood as He said them, without explanation. We leave to God the way in which the mystery is brought about, and in thus leaving it to Him we believe that we are in accord with the mind of the Church of England as well as with the first clear enunciation of the Mystery which we find in any Christian writer. The Church of England asserts the Mystery when she requires us to teach that the Sacrament has two parts—the outward part or sign, and the Inward Part or Thing signified, and that the Inward Part, is "the Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed *taken* and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." Respecting the way in which God unites the outward and the Inward Part, she is silent. In this she is at one with the earliest clear statement of the Sacramental Mystery, that in Irenæus. He is led to consider the opinions of certain heretics who denied the Resurrection of the Body, and he refers them to the twofold nature of the Eucharist. "But our meaning is in harmony with the Eucharist, and the Eucharist again confirms our meaning. And we offer to Him His own, carefully teaching the communication and union, and confessing the Resurrection of the Flesh and Spirit. For as the Bread from the earth, receiving the invocation of God, is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two things, an earthly and a heavenly, so also our bodies, receiving the Eucharist, are no longer perishable, having the hope of the Resurrection of Life Everlasting." (Book IV. ch. xviii. sec. 5.)

THE END.

CHISWICK PRESS: C. WHITTINGHAM AND CO., TOOKS COURT, CHANCERY LANE.

Crown 8vo, red edges, 4/6 each.

CHURCH COMMENTARY

ON THE

NEW TESTAMENT.

WITH NOTES, CRITICAL AND PRACTICAL, INTRODUCTIONS, AND EXCURSUSES.

By the Rev. M. F. Sadler,
Late Rector of Honiton and Prebendary of Wells.

THE GOSPEL OF ST. MATTHEW.

THE GOSPEL OF ST. MARK.

THE GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE.

THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

THE EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS.

THE EPISTLES TO THE GALATIANS, EPHESIANS, AND PHILIPPIANS.

THE EPISTLES TO THE COLOSSIANS, THESSALONIANS, AND TIMOTHY.

THE EPISTLES TO TITUS, PHILEMON, AND THE HEBREWS.

THE EPISTLES OF SS. JAMES, PETER, JOHN, AND JUDE.

THE REVELATION OF ST. JOHN THE DIVINE.

LONDON: GEORGE BELL AND SONS.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

THE GOSPELS.

From The Church Quarterly, *October*, 1883.

"It is far the best practical Commentary that we know, being plain-spoken, fearless, and definite, and containing matter very unlike the milk and water which is often served up in [so-called] practical Commentaries. . . . For solid Church teaching it stands unrivalled. Nothing could be better than the notes on the Sermon on the Mount, and the practical lessons drawn with convincing clearness from our Lord's words on the subject of Almsgiving, Prayer, and Fasting. Throughout the whole book the writer is ever on the watch for general principles and teaching applicable to the wants of our own day, which may legitimately be deduced from the Gospel narrative."

From The Church Times, *February 23rd*, 1883.

"The question of the origin of the Four Gospels is well treated, and a more succinct account of the real standing of the Evangelists with respect to each other, or to a supposed original document from which all copied, could scarcely be found than that contained in these few pages. Some few pages introductory to the critical portion of the volume, and explaining the elements of textual criticism, bring us to the text of the Commentary itself. Throughout the whole of its pages the same evidence of scholarship and critical acumen, which distinguishes all the author's work, is apparent; while the faculty of conveying such knowledge to the minds of the least learned in a simple and forcible manner, is abundantly preserved, and will procure for this work the position of one of the best of popular commentaries. Many of the notes extend beyond the scope generally implied by the term, and become full explanations of doctrinal subjects such as will prove of immense value to the student as well as to the general reader. We may cite as an instance of this exhaustive process the lengthy note on St. Matt. xvi. 18, and those notes on the Parables, which, severally treated in their entirety, present a more intelligible meaning than when explained in short disjointed notes. Finally, it remains to mention the fact, which, however, goes without saying, that the tone of the Commentary is thoroughly Catholic, so that the reader will find here a firm defence of the supernatural and divine character of the Gospel story, which never condescends to the tone of much of modern criticism, but remains true to primitive Catholic teaching."

From Church Bells, *November 18th*, 1882.

"It is written in a clear and sensible style, with a healthy tone; and its practical portions are devout without being wearisome or 'goody.'"

From The Church Review, *November*, 1883.

"A valuable and substantial contribution to the literature of the New Testament is made by Mr. Sadler in the volume now before us. . . . It might be said that every page of the work lights up the grand historical character of the Church as the one supreme authority for the authenticity and interpretation of the books of Scripture."

Uniform with the Church Commentary.

Third edition. Crown 8vo, 5s.

SERMON OUTLINES

FOR THE CLERGY AND LAY-PREACHERS.

321 Outlines arranged according to the Church's Year.

This book, a book of suggestions rather than of mere divisions, or skeletons as they were formerly called, has been composed with a view to meeting the objection heard on all sides that sermons at the present day are very deficient in setting forth Christian doctrines.

From The Guardian, *April 12th*, 1893.

"It is easy to prophesy a considerable sale for this volume. . . . We meet here all the well-known characteristics of his writings. The style is straightforward and vigorous. There is never any doubt about his meaning. His remarks are always pointed, and the arrangement of his material is excellent."

From The Church Times, *February 17th*, 1893.

"This volume differs in three respects from most similar volumes: (1) It aims, primarily, at supplying sketches of sermons on Christian Doctrine, couched in clear, definite language. (2) It is a book of 'suggestions, rather than of mere divisions or skeletons.' (3) It includes lists of texts and subjects for courses of Lenten and other sermons. The well-earned reputation of its author will be a sufficient guarantee for the soundness and usefulness of the work."

From Church Bells, *December 16th*, 1892.

"They are adequate, and they are helpful; they set forth the elementary teaching of the Church's seasons, the redemption, salvation, and sanctification of mankind. Each Sunday of each Church season has several appropriate texts and heads of discourses, and these are rich in wise suggestions as to helpful teaching. There is much simplicity and strong meat for learners. Prayer-book lines are made the rule throughout—the best rule of all."

From The Rock, *November 4th*, 1892.

"We should think that it would be difficult to find anywhere such a real help for preachers as these outlines afford. . . . Such depth of spiritual teaching is seldom to be found."

From The Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette, *Nov. 11th*, 1892.

"This should be among the most popular and useful of Prebendary Sadler's writings."

From The Clergyman's Magazine, *December*, 1892.

"These outlines are both Evangelical and doctrinal. They occupy exactly one page of the book, and therefore afford ample opportunity for the preacher's own powers of expansion."

WORKS BY THE REV. M. F. SADLER,

RECTOR OF HONITON AND PREBENDARY OF WELLS.

New and cheaper Issue, price 2s.

CHURCH DOCTRINE—BIBLE TRUTH. *49th Thousand.*

"Mr. Sadler takes Church Doctrine, specifically so called, subject by subject, and elaborately shows its specially marked Scripturalness. The objective nature of the faith, the Athanasian Creed, the Baptismal Services, the Holy Eucharist, Absolution and the Priesthood, Church Government and Confirmation, are some of the more prominent subjects treated. And Mr. Sadler handles each with a marked degree of sound sense, and with a thorough mastery of his subject."—*Guardian.*

New and cheaper Issue, price 2s.

THE CHURCH TEACHER'S MANUAL OF CHRISTIAN INSTRUCTION. Being the Church Catechism expanded and explained in Question and Answer, for the Use of Clergymen, Parents, and Teachers. *48th Thousand.*

"Far the best book of the kind we have ever seen."—*Literary Churchman.*

Confirmation: An Extract from the "Church Teacher's Manual." *81st-90th Thousand.* *Price* 1*d.*

THE ONE OFFERING: a Treatise on the Sacrificial Nature of the Eucharist. *11th Thousand.* *Price* 2*s.* 6*d.*

"A treatise of singular clearness and force, which gives us what we did not really possess till it appeared."—*Church Times.*

JUSTIFICATION OF LIFE: its Nature, Antecedents, and Results. *2nd Edition, Revised.* *Price* 4*s.* 6*d.*

THE SECOND ADAM and THE NEW BIRTH; or, The Doctrine of Baptism as contained in Holy Scripture. *13th Edition.* *Price* 4*s.* 6*d.*

"The most striking peculiarity of this useful little work is that its author argues almost exclusively from the Bible. We commend it most earnestly to Clergy and Laity, as containing in a small compass, and at a trifling cost, a body of sound and Scriptural doctrine respecting the New Birth, which cannot be too widely circulated." —*Guardian.*

THE SACRAMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY; or, Testimony of the Scripture to the Teaching of the Church on Holy Baptism. *Price* 2*s.* 6*d.*

Cheap Edition. *8th Edition.* *Price* 6*d.*

THE COMMUNICANT'S MANUAL; being a Book of Self-Examination, Prayer, Praise, and Thanksgiving. 32mo. *121st Thousand.* *Price* 1*s.* 6*d.*

Cheap Edition for Distribution. *Price* 8*d.*

A Larger Edition. Red rubrics. Fcap. 8vo. *Price* 2*s.* 6*d.*

SERMONS. Plain Speaking on Deep Truths. 8th Edition. *Price* 6*s.*

Abundant Life, and other Sermons. 2nd Edition. *Price* 6*s.*

LONDON: G. BELL AND SONS, YORK STREET, COVENT GARDEN.

DATE DUE

The Library Store #47-0103

DATE DUE

DURA-CRAFT BOOK BINDERY
2630 KANEVILLE RD., GENEVA, ILL. 60134

NYACK COLLEGE - MANHATTAN